



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

HARVARD STUDIES  
IN  
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

*EDITED BY A COMMITTEE OF THE CLASSICAL  
INSTRUCTORS OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY*

VOLUME V

BOSTON, U.S.A.

PUBLISHED BY GINN & COMPANY

LONDON: GINN & COMPANY

37 & 39 LUDGATE HILL

LEIPSIK: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ

QUER STRASSE 14

1894

1700  
1700

.

.

.







HARVARD STUDIES  
=

IN

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

*EDITED BY A COMMITTEE OF THE CLASSICAL  
INSTRUCTORS OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY*

VOLUME V

BOSTON, U.S.A.

PUBLISHED BY GINN & COMPANY

LONDON: GINN & COMPANY  
57 & 59 LUDGATE HILL

LEIPSIC: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ  
QUER STRASSE 14

1894

## PREFATORY NOTE.

---

THESE Studies are published by authority of Harvard University, and are contributed chiefly by its instructors and graduates, although contributions from other sources are not excluded. The publication is supported by a fund of \$6000, generously subscribed by the class of 1856.

JAMES B. GREENOUGH,  
FREDERIC D. ALLEN,  
MORRIS H. MORGAN, } EDITORIAL  
COMMITTEE.

10 05 30



## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
STAGE-TERMS IN HELIODORUS'S AETHIOPICA . . . . .	1
By J. W. H. Walden.	
NOTES ON THE BACCHAE OF EURIPIDES . . . . .	45
By Mortimer Lamson Earle.	
NOTES ON LYSIAS . . . . .	49
By M. H. Morgan.	
EARLY LATIN PROSODY . . . . .	57
By J. B. Greenough.	
THE κότταβος κατακτός IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT INVESTIGATIONS	73
By Herman W. Hayley.	
DE SCHOLIIS ARISTOPHANEIS QUAESTIONES MYTHICAE . . . .	83
Scripsit Carolus Burton Gulick.	
<i>H</i> AS A MUTE IN LATIN . . . . .	167
By E. S. Sheldon.	



## STAGE-TERMS IN HELIODORUS'S AETHIOPICA.

BY J. W. H. WALDEN.

THE superiority of the *Aethiopica*<sup>1</sup> of Heliodorus to the productions of Achilles Tatius, Eustathius, and the other Greek novelists, is due in great measure to the dramatic feeling of the author. In respect to this dramatic feeling, Heliodorus stands quite by himself among the writers of the class to which he belongs. No other of the novelists has succeeded in developing the plot of his narrative with so much skill and ingenuity,<sup>2</sup> or in imparting to the action so much movement and interest. Besides giving a character to the whole composition, however, his liking for the drama has led him to make a large number of references—some more, some less direct—to the earlier dramatists,<sup>3</sup> and to use,

<sup>1</sup> The references to Heliodorus in this paper are, except when otherwise stated, to page and line of Bekker's ed., Teubner, 1855.

<sup>2</sup> The plot is as a whole carefully put together, but there seem to be one or two loose threads. Thus, from 6, 17, it would appear that the pirates, who lie scattered about on the shore dead, were Egyptians, or men so nearly like Egyptians in general appearance that they could be mistaken for them: ἡ παῖς ἀπέπευσε, καὶ μέλας ἰδοῦσα τὴν χροῖαν καὶ τὴν ὄψιν αἰχμηροῦς, εἰ μὲν εἰδῶλα τῶν κειμένων ἐστὲ, φησὶν. . . . It is necessary to the description on pp. 27 and 28, however, to understand that they were men who would pass for Ionians, 27, 25: γένος μὲν Ἰωνες, and 28, 5: ἄλλων δὲ πολιτῶν εἰς πλῆθος τῶν μὲν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ὁλόκαδα συνεσβάντων. μέλας in the first passage does not mean *black* (cf. 69, 27, of an Ethiopian: τὴν χροῖαν δὲ ἀκριβῶς μέλας), but still the term would hardly fit Ephesian πολῖται. On page 38, Thyamis, the robber-chief, is taken prisoner. When he next turns up (p. 161), it is as the newly-elected captain of the Βησσαεῖς. Three days at the most have intervened between his capture and his election, and no intimation is given of what happened to him between the two events. There has been time for him, however, to fall upon the royal troops with his new band and carry off Theagenes (cf. 161, 23). On page 36, Thyamis supposes he has killed Charicleia. When the two next meet (p. 186), there is no surprise on the part of Thyamis. We have to understand, doubtless, that Theagenes has explained matters to him. For another oversight (p. 137, 30: εὐκραεῖ τῷ πνεύματι), see Korae's note to Bk. V, chap. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Principally Euripides. Korae in his commentary notes many, though not all, of these references.



generally metaphorically, a large number of stage-terms.<sup>1</sup> Many of these terms present no peculiarities, but others show some interesting uses that deserve more than a passing glance. The present is a collection of all the stage-terms used by Heliodorus. The discussions do not in all cases profess to contain positive results, but they may help toward an understanding of some of the passages. Such words as present no peculiar uses, I have registered for the sake of completeness.

In dealing with a writer like Heliodorus, who wrote with a certain amount of dramatic instinct, and employed his stage-terms freely and in a metaphorical way, we may feel that there is a strong presumption that he is taking his figures from what he and his readers had before them in the theatre of their own day. It would be hard to believe that his uses of the terms contain antiquarian references to the theatre of several centuries before his time. On the other hand, we must not look, in a work of this sort and at the hands of such an author, for too much carefulness and clearness. It may even be doubted whether Heliodorus always uses his terms with technical accuracy. Yet there seems to be no good reason for supposing that he does not so use them; the most probable supposition is that he reflects the usage of the people of his day.

It would be a point of importance to know exactly when Heliodorus lived and wrote. Except within wide limits, however, his date is quite uncertain. We are probably safe in saying that the *Aethiopica* was written not earlier than 250 A.D., and not later than 400 A.D.<sup>2</sup>

### 1. δράμα.

The word δράμα bespeaks our attention first, not only as being the stage-term most often used by the Alexandrian and Byzantine novelists, but because it was apparently the generic term applied to

---

<sup>1</sup> It is of course nothing unexpected to find a writer of this period referring often to the early writers. Both in this respect, however, and in respect to the use of dramatic terms, Heliodorus takes precedence of the other novelists.

<sup>2</sup> See Christ, *Geschichte der Gr. Lit.*, p. 604, and Rohde, *Der Gr. Roman*, p. 466.

the whole class of compositions to which the *Aethiopica* belongs.<sup>1</sup> As found in the novels themselves, the word, according to the common statement, oftenest means an action or event such as would form the subject of a stage-drama of the tragic sort, a "pathetisches Ereigniss."<sup>2</sup> The history and meaning of what is apparently the generic use of the word—of its use in application to the compositions themselves—have been the subject of some difference of opinion. Nicolai<sup>3</sup> connects this use with the one just mentioned. "Dieser Ausdruck geht wohl auf die unglücklichen Schicksale, mit denen die Hauptpersonen dieser Romane stets zu ringen haben und welche ihnen eine Aehnlichkeit mit den Helden der Tragödie verleihen, von welcher Dichtungsart das Wort *δρᾶμα* vorzugsweise gebraucht wurde." Rohde,<sup>4</sup> on the other hand, sees in it a reference to the technical division of *δηγήματα* given us by the rhetoricians: ". . . unter *dramatischen Erzählungen* solche verstanden werden, welche zwar erfundene, aber der Möglichkeit thatsächlicher Ereignisse nachgebildete Stoffe behandeln; *dramatische* nannte man sie darum, weil sie, als erfunden und doch der Möglichkeit nicht widersprechend, den Gegenständen der (neuen) Komödie ähnlich waren." In view of this difference of opinion, it may be worth while to review the evidence in the case once again, somewhat more in detail than has yet been done. And first it will be well to see exactly how the word is used by the authors themselves.

(1) *Heliodorus*.

α) Twice the word refers specifically to a dramatic piece, a play.

Β. 17 244, 10, καὶ ἦν ὥσπερ ἐν δράματι προαναφώνησις καὶ προεισόδιον τὸ γινόμενον.

311, 4, νῦν τὴν κορωνίδα τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ὥσπερ λαμπάδιον δράματος.

10.39 Whatever the explanation of these passages, the reference in

<sup>1</sup> The word, however, was, as will be seen later on, of wide application, and perhaps in its transferred uses it never wholly lost its metaphorical character.

<sup>2</sup> Rohde, *Gr. Rom.*, p. 450<sup>2</sup>. See also p. 350<sup>3</sup> and p. 345.

<sup>3</sup> *Ueber Entst. u. Wesen des Gr. Rom.*, p. 82<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> *Gr. Rom.*, p. 350 f., 351<sup>1</sup>. See also Susemihl, *Gesch. d. Gr. Lit. in d. Alex.*, II. p. 574<sup>4</sup>.

δράματι and δράματος is to theatrical plays,<sup>1</sup> and therefore the word need not detain us here.

- 5.6 δ) 129, 1-7, τοιοῦτον παίζει καθ' ἡμῶν πόλεμον, ὥσπερ σκηνὴν τὰ ἡμέτερα καὶ δρᾶμα πεποιημένους· τί οὖν οὐχ ὑποτέμνομεν αὐτοῦ τὴν τραγικὴν ταύτην ποιήσιν, καὶ τοῖς βουλομένοις ἀναιρεῖν ἐγχειρίζομεν, μὴ πῃ καὶ ὑπέρογκον τὸ τέλος τοῦ δράματος φιλοτιμούμενος, καὶ αὐτόχειρας ἡμᾶς ἐαυτῶν ἐκβιάσθαι γενέσθαι;

δρᾶμα is here helped out by σκηνὴν and τραγικὴν ποιήσιν. The reference in all three expressions is to the long series of adventures encountered by Charikleia and Theagenes on land and sea. They form the material, in a way, of a play such as might be represented in the theatre, in which the two, Charikleia and Theagenes, are the central figures. It is not necessary to understand that shipwrecks, rapes by pirates, and similar scenes, were represented in the theatre. The point of resemblance seems to lie in the fact that there were adventures, that there was *action*, in connection with certain characters, and (in this particular case) that there was a tragic element in this action.

- 7.6 ε) 185, 9-20, ὅτε δὴ . . . ἡ πόλις δὲ ὥσπερ ἐκ θεάτρων περιεστῶσα τοῦ τείχους ἠθλοθέτει τὴν θῆαν, τότε δὴ πως εἴτε τι δαιμόνιον εἴτε τύχη τις τάνθρωπεια βραβεύουσα, καινὸν ἐπεισόδιον ἐπετραγῶδει τοῖς δρωμένοις, ὥσπερ εἰς ἀνταγώνισμα δράματος ἀρχὴν ἄλλον παρεισφέρουσα, καὶ τὸν Καλάσιριν εἰς ἡμέραν καὶ ὥραν ἐκείνην ὥσπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς σύνδρομόν τε καὶ οὐκ εὐτυχῇ θεωρὸν τῷ περὶ ψυχῆς ἀγῶνι τῶν παίδων ἐφίστησι.

The brothers Thyamis and Petosiris are engaged in a *μονομαχία* before the walls of the city. This is the δρᾶμα, or at least that part of the δρᾶμα which is being enacted. In the middle of the contest, or rather before the contest has really begun, and while Thyamis is chasing his brother round the city, Kalasiris, the father of the two, appears on the scene. This is the καινὸν ἐπεισόδιον. Here again it is the *action*, the event, the thing that takes place, that is conceived of as a drama. The people on the walls of the

<sup>1</sup> See, however, for the latter passage, p. 34<sup>1</sup> below.

city direct it ὥσπερ ἐκ θεάτρον.<sup>1</sup> The figure is continued further on, when Charikleia unexpectedly comes up, 186, 29, ἕτερον ἐγίνετο 7.7  
 παρεγκύκλημα τοῦ δράματος ἡ Χαρίκλεια. And again, 188, 2, ἐφ' 7.8  
 ἅπασι δὲ τὸ ἐρωτικὸν μέρος τοῦ δράματος, ἡ Χαρίκλεια καὶ ὁ Θεαγένης  
 ἐπήκμαζον. The father has reconciled the two brothers; the lovers,  
 Charikleia and Theagenes, have recognized each other; amid great  
 rejoicing they all enter the city. The whole succession of events,  
 then, from the beginning of the hand-to-hand contest to the return  
 into the city, is a δράμα. In this case the idea of a τραγικὴ ποιήσις  
 seems not to be so prominent as in the preceding. Indeed, it may  
 be questioned whether there is any such idea in the passage at all.  
 Petosiris runs at the first onset of Thyamis, and the contest which  
 is no contest ends amid a scene of general rejoicing. Perhaps the  
 most that can be said is that it is a piece of *action*, an event, — what  
 we should call a *scene* without any side implication as to the nature  
 of the scene.

d) 69, 7, ἐπετραγῶδει τούτῳ τῷ δράματι καὶ ἕτερον πάθος ὁ δαίμων, 2.2  
 καὶ τὴν μητέρα μοι τῆς παιδὸς ἀφαιρᾷται τοῖς θρήνοις ἐγκαρτερήσασαν.

The first misfortune was the death of his (Charikles's) daughter on the night of her marriage. The use of the word δράμα in this passage shows a considerable advance upon its use in the passages previously considered. It seems to mean nothing more than (tragic) *event*, but there is a color to the expression which is gained from its theatrical associations. The death of the daughter is conceived of as an event, an *action*, to which the priest is in a way subjected by the god. It is worthy of note that πάθος is here used as a synonym of δράμα. There will be occasion to touch upon this point farther on.<sup>2</sup> Attention may also be called to ἐπετραγῶδει.

e) 168, 5, οὕτω τὸ δράμα τὸ περὶ ἡμᾶς εἰς ἄπειρον ἐμγκύνατε, καὶ L. 8  
 πᾶσαν λοιπὸν σκηνὴν ὑπερφθέγγεται.

<sup>1</sup> There is, as it happens, a striking resemblance between this scene and the actual stage scene in Eurip. Phoen. 1219 ff. Such a connection, however, is of course not necessary to explain the use of the δράματος here in Heliodorus. Many features of this scene, it may be remarked, are borrowed from Il. XXII.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 17<sup>1</sup> below.

The address is to the gods, and the *δρᾶμα* is the whole series of misfortunes through which Charikleia has passed. 'They surpass any drama seen on the stage.'

1.3 f) Similar to the above is 6, 25, λύσατε τῶν περιεστηκότων ἀλγεινῶν, φόνῳ τῷ καθ' ἡμῶν δρᾶμα τὸ περὶ ἡμᾶς καταστρέψαντες.

2.11 g) 48, 10, ὡς κἀγὼ σε καὶ κειμένην ἔχω δι' ὑποψίας, καὶ σφόδρα δέδοικα μὴ καὶ πλάσμα ἐστὶν ἡ Δημαινέτης τελευτή, κάμῃ μὲν ἡπάτησαν οἱ ἐξαγγέλαντες, σὺ δὲ καὶ διαπόντιος ἦκεις ἐτέραν καθ' ἡμῶν σκηνὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τραγυδῆσουσα. — οὐ παύσῃ . . . οὐ γὰρ δὴ κάμῃ γε καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ὄψιν εἶποις ἂν ὡς ἐγοήτευσεν, οὐδὲν κοινωνοῦντα τοῦ δράματος.

Thisbe has been the moving agency in an elaborate plot against Knemon at Athens. The latter now sees her lying dead at his feet, but distrusts her even so. Theagenes, however, who has had no connection with the events at Athens, reassures him.

6.12 h) 172, 21, πλῆθος τι κειμένων νεκρῶν ὀρώσι νεοσφαγῶν, τῶν μὲν πλειόνων Περσῶν εἶναι τῇ στολῇ τε καὶ καθοπλίσει γνωριζομένων, ὀλίγων δὲ τινῶν ἐγχωρίων. καὶ πόλεμον μὲν εἶναι τὸ δρᾶμα εἶκαζον.

The *δρᾶμα* in this case seems to be far remote from anything connected with the theatre, but it still contains the underlying notion of *action, something that has taken place*: 'they conjectured that what had taken place was a war.'

2.23 i) 62, 7, καὶ ὦρα σοι τὸ δρᾶμα καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῷ λόγῳ διασκευάζειν.

The *δρᾶμα* here referred to is Kalasiris's narrative, which extends, with a few interruptions, through part of Bk. II, Bk. III, Bk. IV, and part of Bk. V. Knemon tells Kalasiris that it is time for him to begin his narrative, — to arrange the action of his story as he would arrange the action of a play. This is a very important passage, for it is one of the two undoubted cases in which the word *δρᾶμα* is used by the novelists with reference distinctly to a story.<sup>1</sup> Rohde says<sup>2</sup> that the novelists used no technical term in speaking

<sup>1</sup> The other being Eustathius, XI, 23; see p. 13 below.

<sup>2</sup> *Gr. Rom.*, p. 350.

of their productions. There may be a question in regard to this statement, as we shall see later; but *δρᾶμα*, referring to Kalasiris's narrative, is at least started on the way toward being such a technical term. As this is an undoubted case of *δρᾶμα* referring to a story, it is important for our purpose that we find out if we can, just what Heliodorus meant by the word. For that purpose, we must go back a little way in the story. Knemon (Bk. II, chap. XXI) comes upon the old man Kalasiris wandering on the banks of the Nile in apparent distress of mind. The two question each other and strike an acquaintance. At length the old man proposes that they cross the river and enter the village, promising to entertain Knemon and tell him the story of his life, as well as to give Knemon an opportunity to tell his story. The two enter the old man's abode. Then Knemon questions his host again. Kalasiris answers that *he has been very unfortunate, his children have been kidnapped, and he has wandered long and far in search of them*. But the old man refuses to tell his tale until after supper. Supper being disposed of, Knemon starts the conversation thus: 62, 3, ὁ Διόνυσος, εἶπεν, οἶσθα, ὦ πάτερ, ὡς χαίρει μύθοις καὶ κωμωδίας φιλεῖ. καὶ μὲν δὴ οὖν τὰ νῦν εἰσφικισμένους ἀνίησι πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν, τὸν τε ἐπηγγελημένον πρὸς σοῦ μισθὸν ἀπαιτεῖν ἐπείγει. (εἰσφικισμένους refers of course to the wine Knemon has drunk. The last words are explained by saying that Knemon had promised to restore Kalasiris's children safe and sound if he, Kalasiris, would repay him by narrating his adventures.) Then follow the words καὶ ὥρα σοι, etc. To what do μύθοις and κωμωδίας refer? The words might conceivably mean *stories, narratives*.<sup>1</sup> Would this interpretation, however, be applicable in the present case? Elsewhere Heliodorus understands Hermes to be the god who is pleased with stories: 137, 15, τὸν Ἑρμῆν τῷ Διονύσῳ συγκαθιδρύων καὶ λόγων ἡδυσμα τῷ πότῳ συναναχίων. . . . οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ὅπως μᾶλλον ἢ τις τὸν Ἑρμῆν ἰλάσαιο ἢ τὸ οἰκίστατον ἐκείνῳ λόγους εἰς εὐωχίαν ἐρανίζομενος. κωμωδίας must mean here properly *comedies*, and in that case μύθοις must refer to tragedies. For μῦθοι in the sense of tragedy themes, cf. Ach. Tat. I, 3, τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε, and I. 8, ὅσων ἐνέπλησαν μύθων γυναῖκες τὴν σκηνήν. If we follow this interpretation of the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rohde, *Gr. Rom.*, p. 351<sup>1</sup>.



words, Knemon is represented as saying : ' You know that Dionysus is pleased with tragedies and likes comedies. And so, having established himself in me, he gives me the same liking, and it is time for you to bring on your play now.' It is not necessary to understand the passage to imply that the *δράμα* in question contained both *μῦθοι* and *κωμυδία* ; simply, as far as the language goes, it may be either the one or the other. As a matter of fact, it is much more of a tragedy than a comedy. I would call attention to the words *καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῷ λόγῳ διασκενάζειν*, as showing that the prominent idea in Heliodorus's mind in connection with the word *δράμα* is that of *action*.

(2) *Achilles Tatius*.<sup>1</sup>

a) Once the word means a play properly.

I, 8, ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ἰδιώτης ἦσθα μουσικῆς γνώσεως, ἡγνόεις ἂν τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν δράματα· νῦν δὲ κἂν ἄλλοις λέγοις, ὅσων ἐνέπλησαν μύθων γυναικες τὴν σκηνήν.

All we have to notice here is that *δράματα* are tragedies rather than comedies.

δ) I, 3, ἐδέησεν οὖν τῷ πατρὶ γυναικὸς ἐτέρας, ἐξ ἧς ἀδελφὴ μοι Καλλιγόνῃ γίνεται. καὶ ἐδόκει μὲν τῷ πατρὶ συνάψαι μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς γάμψ· αἱ δὲ μοῖραι τῶν ἀνθρώπων κρείττονες, ἄλλην ἐτήρουν μοι γυναῖκα. . . . ἐπεὶ γὰρ εἶχον ἔνατον ἔτος ἐπὶ τοῖς δέκα, καὶ παρεσκεύαζεν ὁ πατήρ εἰς νέωτα ποιῆσαι τοὺς γάμους, ἤρχετο τοῦ δράματος ἡ τύχη.

*δράματος* here refers to the whole series of events which follow and make up the book. It is explained more fully by a passage in the preceding chapter : τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε. *μύθοις* are here tragedy themes, as in the passage I, 8. Cf. also 2, μύθων ἐρωτικῶν.

c) I, 9, ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Κλεινίαν καταλέγω μου τὸ δράμα, πῶς ἐγένετο, πῶς πάθοιμι, πῶς ἴδοιμι, τὴν καταγωγὴν, τὸ δεῖπνον, τὸ κάλλος τῆς κόρης.

τὸ *δράμα* refers to the course of Kleitophon's love for Leukippe.

d) V, 5, ὑφαίνει γὰρ πέπλον ἄγγελον, καὶ τὸ δράμα πλέκει ταῖς κρίκαις.

<sup>1</sup> I have followed in general the edition of Jacobs, 1821.

Tereus cuts out Philomela's tongue, but she tells the story of her sufferings in her handiwork. Cf. below in the same chapter, πρὸς αὐτὴν ἃ πέπονθε τῇ κερκίδι λαλεῖ, and καὶ τηροῦσι ἔτι τοῦ πάθους τὴν εἰκόνα.

ε) VI, 3, ἐμοὶ δὲ ἡ συνήθης τύχη πάλιν ἐπιτίθεται, καὶ συντίθεται κατ' ἐμοῦ δράμα καινόν.

ς) VIII, 5, καὶ γὰρ πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀποδημίαν τὴν ἀπὸ Τύρου διηγούμαι . . . Ἐν μόνον παρήκα τῶν ἑμμαντοῦ δραμάτων, τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς Μελίττην αἰδῶ.

The meaning of δραμάτων is very restricted here. The word refers to the events which befell the speaker, or in which the speaker took a part.

γ) VIII, 5, ὁ δὲ Σώστρατος καὶ ἐπεδάκρυνεν, εἴ ποτε τὸ κατὰ Λευκίππην ἐγεγόνει δράμα.<sup>1</sup>

Sostratus shed tears whenever the adventures of Leukippe were touched upon (in the narrative).

δ) VIII, 9, τὸ γὰρ δράμα σου τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγρῶν ἡκούσαμεν.

ι) VIII, 10, τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον τοῦ δράματος, πᾶσαν ἀπεκάλυψε τὴν αἰδῶ.

VIII, 15, οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἡμῖν τὸν μῦθον τῶν τῆς Φάρου ληστῶν, καὶ τῆς ἀποτμηθείσης ἐκεῖ τὸ αἶνγμα κεφαλῆς, ἵνα σου καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἀκούσῃ; τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον ἐνδείκει πρὸς ἀκρόασιν τοῦ παντὸς δράματος.

The last two passages show us δράμα verging on the meaning *story*. Thus τοῦ παντὸς δράματος refers of course to 'the whole adventure,' but it may also be considered as the narrative of the adventure.

ε) V, 3, Πρόκνης γὰρ εἶχε φθορὰν, καὶ τὴν βίαν Τηρέως, καὶ τῆς γλώττης τὴν τομήν. ἦν δὲ ὁλόκληρον τῇ γραφῇ τὸ διήγημα τοῦ δράματος, ὁ πέπλος, ὁ Τηρεὺς, ἡ τράπεζα.<sup>2</sup> III, 7, τὸ μὲν τῆς Ἀνδρομέδας δράμα τοῦτο.

<sup>1</sup> Hirschig: ὅποτε [τὸ] κατὰ Λευκίππην ἐγεγόνει [δράμα.] Hercher: ὅποτε κατὰ Λευκίππην ἐγεγόνει. See Hercher's *adnotatio critica*, p. xxxi. I see no good reason for bracketing and changing the person against the consensus of the MSS., which are with Jacobs.

<sup>2</sup> The text is on the face of it corrupt. Φιλομήλας, not Πρόκνης, is needed. See Hercher's *adm. crit.*, p. xxiv, and Jacobs, p. 761.

The last passage refers to a painting of the story of Andromeda.

Ι) II, 28, οὐκ ἐρείς, ἔφη, τὴν κατασκευὴν<sup>1</sup> τοῦ δράματος;

Referring to an attempted rape.

π) VI, 16, φέρε πάλιν ἐνδύσωμαί<sup>2</sup> μου τὸ δράμα· φέρε πάλιν περίθωμαι τὴν Λάκαιναν.

Here δράμα seems to be almost equal to πρόσωπον.<sup>3</sup> The transition is of course one from the idea of playing a part. The girl is playing a part in representing herself to be a slave. This is brought out more fully a few lines earlier in the same chapter: ἀρα ἀποκαλύψασα τοῦ δράματος τὴν ὑπόκρισιν, διηγήσομαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν; Here δράματος refers to the deception she is practising. The use may be the same in VII, 2, ὡς οὖν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετό μου πλησίον, καὶ τοῦ δράματος ἤρχετο, where the man was put into the same apartment with Kleitophon to play a part. More probably, however, the word is used simply of action, without any idea of deception, as in I, 3, above (p. 8), ἤρχετο τοῦ δράματος ἡ τύχη.

ν) Quite peculiar is I, 10, μὴ τοίνυν ὀκνήσης, ἐὰν ἀνθισταμένην αὐτὴν ἴδῃς, ἀλλ' ἐπιτήρει πῶς ἀνθίσταται. σοφίας γὰρ κἀνταῦθα δεῖ. κἀν μὲν προσκαρτερῇ, ἐπίσχεσ τὴν βίαν· οὕτω γὰρ πείθεται· ἐὰν δὲ μαλθακώτερον ἦδη θέλῃς, χορήγησον τὴν ὑπόκρισιν, μὴ ἀπολέσης σου τὸ δράμα.

The passage is part of a recipe for making love. The idea is apparently, 'so as not to spoil your game'; δράμα being equal to πρᾶγμα, *res*.

ο) III, 23, ὦ θάλαττα ἄγνωμον, ἐφθόνησας ἡμῖν ὀλοκλήρου τοῦ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας σου δράματος.

Menelaus and the two lovers have been saved, but the sea has not completed its act of benevolence; Kleinias is lost. The force of δράμα here is hard to grasp. The act of benevolence by which the three have been brought out of the shipwreck safe is apparently thought of as an *adventure* to those involved.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hercher: συσκευήν.

<sup>2</sup> Here Jacobs reads future indicative.

<sup>3</sup> Compare *scaena* used similarly in Apul. Met. IV, 20.

<sup>4</sup> In VIII, 5, Hercher reads ἐπεὶ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μελίτην ἐγενόμην ἐξῆρον τὸ δράμα φεμαντοῦ, where the MSS. have not δράμα, but πρᾶγμα.

(3) *Eustathius*.<sup>1</sup>

a) II, 6, τὸ δὲ περὶ ταύτας δρᾶμα καὶ τίνες αὐταὶ μαθεῖν ἐζητοῦμεν φιλοπονώτερον.

Hysminias, while walking in the garden, sees a picture in which are represented four maidens. Their attitude and costume suggest that they are symbolical in some way—that there is some story connected with them. He is at a loss to understand what it all means and who the maidens are. Then he sees an inscription, which runs: Φρόνησις, Ἴσχυς, Σωφροσύνη καὶ Θέμις, and this explains to him the painting. The use of δρᾶμα in this passage may be compared to its use in Ach. Tat., V, 3, and III, 7, quoted above (p. 9). In no one of the three passages is any actual drama in the writer's mind, built upon the theme in question, though such might conceivably be thought to be the case in the passages from Achilles Tatius. The word signifies, *what has taken place* or *the narrative of what has taken place—the story*. It is worthy of note that, though there is of course a tragical element in the δράματα of Tereus and Andromeda, there is hardly any such in the present case. It is not true that δρᾶμα always and of necessity refers to a tragical event. The present passage explains one further on: II, 8, ἔχω σου, τεχνῖτα, τὸ αἶνγμα, ἔχω σου τὸ δρᾶμα· εἰς αὐτόν σου βάπτω τὸν νοῦν. After explaining to himself satisfactorily the meaning of the four maidens, he looks about and discovers a second picture. Upon learning the key to this, which is also symbolical, he utters the words just quoted. *Meaning* suits as a translation of the word very well. What the word, without doubt, does not signify in this case is the *deed, performance, production* of the artist. Rather, it refers to the story which he has symbolized in his work.

δ) V, 10, καὶ τὸν νοῦν ὅλον καταλαβοῦσα τοῦ δράματος εὐχαριστεῖ μοι τῷ σχήματι.

The explanation of the words is this: The occasion is a meal at which the two lovers are present. The cup is handed to Hysminias. He begins to drink, but bethinks himself, and, with a few words of

<sup>1</sup> I have followed in general Hilberg's edition, 1876.

chiding to Kratisthenes for having handed it to him out of his turn, bids him give it first to Hysmine, who reclines directly opposite. She understands, and touches the cup with her lips at the spot at which Hysminias has drunk. The whole proceeding is of course a device for bringing about this very result. δράματος may refer distinctly to the *act* of Hysminias; I think, however, that the reference is not quite so definite, and that the figure is still that of a play. The whole proceeding may be considered as a sort of δράμα (a piece of acting). Here there cannot possibly be any side idea of a *tragical* proceeding.

c) VI, 13, ἐγὼ σοι καθυπηρετήσω τῷ δράματι· καὶ, χαίροις, εἰπὼν μοι περὶ τὴν διασκευὴν τοῦ πράγματος ᾤχετο.

VI, 16, τὸ πᾶν ἐκκαλύψω τοῦ δράματος. Cf. in same chapter, τὸ μηκέτι πρὸς ἀναβολὰς χωρεῖν μοι τοῦ πράγματος.

VII, 3, καὶ ὁλῶ καθυπηρετήσῃ τῷ δράματι.

These three passages refer to one and the same thing. Hysminias undertakes to carry off (with her own consent) Hysmine, and Kratisthenes promises to assist him. Here, as in V, 10, above, *affair*, *proceeding*, rather than *act*, is the translation of the word. Cf. the use of πρᾶγμα in these passages.

d) VIII, 11, τὰ δ' ἄλλα ζητοῦσα μαθεῖν ὅλον δράμα ζητεῖς καὶ ὅλον τραγῳδῆμα.

VIII, 14, ὅλον δράμα τὰ κατὰ σέ καὶ ὄντως τραγῳδῆμα.

IX, 10, ὅλον γὰρ δράμα τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀνεπλάττετο.

The reference in the first two passages is to the adventures of Hysminias; in the last, to those of Hysminias and Hysmine. The use of δράμα is here the same as we have already seen it to be in many cases in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius. It is the same in the following passages. After Hysmine has been freed from her captivity and united to Hysminias, the priest speaks thus: XI, 12, εἴτα σοὶ μὲν Ἀπόλλων ἐλευθερίαν χαρίζεται καὶ τὸν καλὸν τοῦτον Ὑσμινίαν ἐπινυμφεύει σοι· σὺ δ' οὐδ' αὐτὸ δὴ τὸ κατὰ σέ δράμα θύσεις Ἀπόλλωνι, ἢ αἰωνίζον εἷη τὸ διήγημα καὶ μὴ φθίνον τὸ τερατούργημα,<sup>1</sup> ὃ μέγας Ἀπόλλων

<sup>1</sup> For a different reading see Hercher.

οὕτω καινῶς ἐφ' ἑμῖν φοιβάζων τερατουργεῖ; The δρᾶμα here refers to Hysmine's adventures; τὸ κατὰ σὲ δρᾶμα θύσεις Ἀπόλλωνι means virtually *put your adventures (or the account of your adventures) in the keeping of the priest of Apollo*. This she shortly does by narrating what has befallen her. We may notice that δρᾶμα, which would seem to mean *adventures*, is immediately followed by διήγημα, the *account*. Further on Hysminias prays that the memory of the adventures of Hysmine and himself may never die: XI, 22, σὺ δ', ὦ Γῆ μήτηρ, εἰ τὴν Δάφνην φεύγουσαν ἐλεεῖς καὶ κρύπτεις καὶ σώξεις καὶ φυτὸν ὁμώνυμον αὐτομάτως γενῆς εἰς μνήμης συντήρησιν, εἰ τὸν Ὑάκινθον ἐξ ὁμωνύμου φυτοῦ φυλάττεις θάνατον, ἡμῖν οὐ συντηρήσεις τὴν μνήμην, φυτὰ δ' οὐκ ἀναδώσεις ὁμώνυμα στήλας θανάτους τῶν καθ' Ὑσμίνην ταύτην καὶ τὸν Ὑσμινίαν ἐμέ, ὅλον δρᾶμα τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς τοῖς φυτοῖς καταζωγραφοῦσα καὶ καταστηλιτεύουσα καὶ τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς φυλάττουσα τὴν μνήμην θάνατον; Then at the very close (XI, 23) occurs this paragraph: ὅσον μὲν οὖν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐρωτικώτερον, τῶν πολλῶν ἐρωτικῶν χαρίτων ἡμᾶς ἀποδέχεται, καὶ ὅσον παρθενικὸν καὶ σεμνότερον, τῆς σωφροσύνης πάλιν ἀγασέται.<sup>1</sup> ὅσον δὲ συμπαθέστερον, ἐλεήσει τῶν δυστυχημάτων ἡμᾶς, καὶ οὕτως ἡμῖν ἔσται τὰ τῆς μνήμης θάνατα. ἡμεῖς δὲ καταχαριώσομεν τὴν γραφὴν καὶ ὅλην τὴν βίβλον κατακοσμήσομεν καὶ χάρισιν ἐρωτικαῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅσα βίβλους κοσμοῦσι καὶ τοὺς λόγους κατακαλλύνουσι. κλήσις δ' ἔσται τῇ βίβλῳ τὸ καθ' Ὑσμίνην δρᾶμα καὶ τὸν Ὑσμινίαν ἐμέ.<sup>2</sup> Here is an undoubted case in which the word δρᾶμα is used by one of these authors in reference to his own work.<sup>3</sup> It is true that here it seems rather a part of the title of the work than a descriptive

<sup>1</sup> See Hercher here.

<sup>2</sup> The word δρᾶμα occurs in the title of the work in some MSS. Thus, ε: ποίημα εὐσταθίου πρωτοσυβελασίμου καὶ μεγάλου χαρτοφύλακος τοῦ μακρεμβολίτου τὸ καθ' Ὑσμίνην καὶ Ὑσμινίαν δρᾶμα. θ: τὸ καθ' Ὑσμινίαν καὶ Ὑσμίνην δρᾶμα· ποίημα εὐσταθίου φιλοσόφου. These titles, however, probably did not proceed from the hand of Eustathius in their present form. Cf. Hilberg's ed., praef., p. XLVII, ff.

<sup>3</sup> I am unable to decide just what Rohde's view on this point is. In his text, *Gr. Rom.*, p. 350, he says that the authors themselves seem not to have known or made use of a technical term for their compositions. In a note, p. 350<sup>1</sup>, while apparently citing the cases in which the technical use of the words δρᾶμα and δραματικόν is found, he remarks that Eustathius called his own work τὸ καθ' Ὑσμίνην καὶ Ὑσμινίαν δρᾶμα. Elsewhere (p. 522), he translates the title: 'des Eustathius des Philosophen Erzählung von Hysmine und Hysminias.'



name of the kind of work, and that there is a slight difference between the two. Should we say that the book is "The Adventures of Hysmine and Hysminias," or that it is a *story* about Hysmine and Hysminias? Does *δράμα*, that is, signify what actually happened to the two lovers, or does it refer to the written and finished composition which tells about those adventures? Evidently *δράμα* is used in this title of the work in the same general way in which it is used in VIII, 11, 14; IX, 10; XI, 12, 22. The adventures of the two lovers have the term *δράμα* applied to them in XI, 12, and XI, 22, because they resemble an actual stage-*δράμα* and *τραγῷδῆμα* in their character. This resemblance is stated distinctly enough in VIII, 14, *ὅλον δράμα τὰ κατὰ σὲ καὶ ὄντως τραγῷδῆμα* = 'your adventures form a perfect drama and a veritable tragedy.' Primarily, therefore, and as used in the title of the work, we must suppose the word in question to refer to the *δράμα* which happened *to* the two lovers—to their dramatic adventures. Then, as a second step in its development, the composition which contains such adventures, such happenings to people, such action, would itself be called a *δράμα*.

(4) *Chariton*.<sup>1</sup>

a) I, 4, *ταῦτα οὖν προκατασκευασάμενος ὁ δημιουργὸς τοῦ δράματος*. . . . VI, 3, *ὅλον τὸ δράμα τοῦτο ἐκείνη κατεσκεύασε*.

Of a plot, in each case.

b) IV, 4, *ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ φιλόκαινος τύχη δράμα σκυθρωπὸν ὑμῖν περιτέθεικε*. . . .

The reference is to a series of adventures, but the terms used would seem to suggest that the idea of a mask was not wholly absent from the writer's mind.

The word occurs in Theodorus Prodrōmus as follows<sup>2</sup>: I, 349, IX, 36 (perhaps meaning *act*, but more probably *tragic event*); I, 393 (of a wonderful event); VI, 280 (tragic event); VI, 180 (τὸ

<sup>1</sup> I have used Hercher's edition, 1859.

<sup>2</sup> Hercher's edition. (N.B. It is *δράμα* in five of the eight passages in Theodorus.)

δρᾶμα τῆς ἐμῆς . . . τύχης); VIII, 379, 493 (similar to VI, 180); IX, 413 (of a humorous experience). The passages need not be considered more in detail. Xenophon the Ephesian, Longus, Nicetas Eugenianus, and Constantinus Manasses do not use the word.<sup>1</sup>

We have then one undoubted case in which the word δρᾶμα is used by an author in reference to his own composition. An examination of the word as found elsewhere in the same author, and as used by the other novelists, seems to leave us but one way in which to explain its use in this case. The composition of Eustathius is called a δρᾶμα because it contains incidents which may be considered *dramatic*, and to which the term δρᾶμα is applied by the author himself. Thus in Ach. Tat. VIII, 15, τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον ἐνδέει πρὸς ἀκρόασιν τοῦ παντὸς δράματος (see p. 9), both the events and the account of the events would come under the head of δρᾶμα. In the case of Hel. 62, 7, καὶ ὥρα σοι τὸ δρᾶμα καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῷ λόγῳ διασκενάζειν (see p. 6), Kalasiris's adventures, as well as the account of those adventures, would be called a δρᾶμα.

The word *dramatic* has been used. The question arises, What was included under the term? What was the nature of the events to which these novelists applied the word δρᾶμα? It is apparent from our survey of the uses of the word that its range of application is very great. At times it is used of a whole series of adventures; again, it is applied to a single event. It seems to be true, however, that whatever is considered as taking place in connection with a person or persons—whatever may be looked upon as a piece of action—is a δρᾶμα. That the δρᾶμα in this sense is always a tragic δρᾶμα seems not to be the case. It is true that the word very often seems to refer to the tragedy, but not always and necessarily. The δρᾶμα in Hel. 185, 16; 186, 29; 188, 2, can hardly be considered of a tragic character. The δράματα of Eust. II, 6, and II, 8, seem to

<sup>1</sup> δρᾶμα in the sense of 'pathetisches Ereigniss' is probably not found in the early literature, though it is used of a stage-effect; e.g. Pl. Apol. 35 B. In general, the early authors use the word with nothing like the freedom of the Alexandrians and Byzantines. In the late literature outside of the novelists it is used frequently in quite the senses we have observed above; e.g. Walz. Rh. Gr. I, p. 601, Plut. de Gen. Soc. 30 (Moral. 596).

have no definite character at all.<sup>1</sup> The *δρᾶμα* of Eust. V, 10, is rather of the comedy order. Still less is it the case that there is any necessary implication in the word of a comedy action. Kalasiris's *δρᾶμα* is much more of a tragedy in every respect than a comedy. It is serious, full of woes, and does not even have a happy ending. Even if we could believe that Eustathius's novel is of the character of a comedy, we have Eustathius's own words to tell us that he looked upon it in the light of a tragedy. It may indeed be asked if the novels of Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius have not as much in common with the Tragedy as with the Comedy. The endings are happy; that is a feature of the Comedy. Most of the characters are every-day characters, similar to those of the Comedy. Many of Euripides's characters, however, are much of the same sort. The action of the novels is quite as much of the tragedy as of the comedy order. The term *dramatic*, then, as used above, has no necessary implication other than that of *action* (irrespective of the sort of action).

The only other writer who refers to these compositions as *δράματα* is Photius. It is an interesting fact, and one perhaps not wholly without significance, that he uses the plural form four times. Thus, in reference to Achilles's novel he says, cod. 87 (66a, 24): πολλήν δὲ ὁμοιότητα ἐν τῇ διασκευῇ καὶ πλάσει τῶν διηγημάτων, πλὴν σχεδόν τι τῶν προσώπων τῆς ὀνομασίας καὶ τῆς μυσαρᾶς αἰσχροτύτου, πρὸς τὰ τοῦ Ἡλιοδώρου δράματα φυλάττει. In what sense could Photius speak of Heliodorus's novel as *δράματα*? Elsewhere he uses the singular in reference to the same work, cod. 73, (50a, 18): καὶ ἔστιν αὐτῷ ἡ τοῦ δράματος ὑπόθεσις Χαρίκλεια καὶ Θεαγένης. He can hardly be referring, in using the plural, to the several books, as *ἱστορίαι* and *χρηστομάθειαι* and *πραγματεῖαι* might be used of the several books of a treatise. The division into books in the present case seems quite arbitrary; there is no such natural division of the narrative at these breaks that each book might be considered a *δρᾶμα* in itself. Rather, he would seem to conceive of the whole composition in his mind as containing various small scenes or descriptions. Thus, the account

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Theod. Prod. IX, 413 above, quite in the sense of *πᾶθος*, but of a pleasant or humorous experience.

of the fight before the walls of the city (Bk. VII, chap. 5 ff.) might be thought of as a *δράμα*, or the description of the meeting of Knemon and Kalasiris on the banks of the Nile (Bk. II, chap. 21 ff.). In fact, any short account of a piece of action, whatever the character of the action, would come under this head; also the action itself would be a *δράμα*. In the same way, Photius calls the work of Antonius Diogenes *δράματα*, cod. 166 (111a, 30): ὁ γοῦν Διογένης, ὁ καὶ Ἀντώνιος, ταῦτα πάντα Δεινίαν εἰσαγαγὼν πρὸς Κύμβαν τερατευσάμενον, ὅμως γράφει Φανστίνῃ ὅτι τε συντάττει περὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἀπίστων, καὶ ὅτι τῇ ἀδελφῇ Ἰσιδώρῃ φιλομαθῶς ἐχούσῃ τὰ δράματα προσφωνεῖ. Also, 111b, 30: οὕτω μὲν οὖν καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἡ τῶν δραμάτων πλάσις τῷ Ἀντωνίῳ Διογένει ἐσχημάτισται. We have not Diogenes's work before us, but only the summary of it which Photius gives us. From this summary, however, it would seem that the plural *δράματα* would be rather more descriptive in this case than the singular *δράμα*, though the singular also might undoubtedly be used of the work considered as a whole. Photius uses the plural also in cod. 94 (73b, 27), in speaking of Iamblichus, Heliodorus, and Achilles: οἱ γὰρ τρεῖς οὗτοι σχεδὸν τι τὸν αὐτὸν σκοπὸν προθέμενοι ἐρωτικῶν δραμάτων ὑποθέσεις ὑπεκρίθησαν, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Ἡλιοδωρος, etc. The plural in this case, however, refers rather to the three novels individually than to the various parts of any one of the three.<sup>1</sup> Iamblichus's novel is called a *δράμα*, Phot. cod. 94 (74a, 4): εἰσὶ δὲ αὐτῷ πεποιημένα τοῦ δράματος πρόσωπα, etc. Elsewhere the word *δραματικόν* is applied to all these compositions. Cod. 73, ἀνεγνώθη Ἡλιοδώρου Αἰθιοπικόν· ἔστι δὲ τὸ σύνταγμα δραματικόν. Cod. 87, ἀνεγνώθησαν Ἀλεξανδρείῳς Ἀχιλλεύς Τατίου τῶν περὶ

<sup>1</sup> With this use of *ἐρωτικῶν δραμάτων* as an expression descriptive of these novels, we may compare certain other expressions. Chariton in the beginning of his narrative (I, 1) says that he will tell of a *πάθος ἐρωτικόν*. *πάθος* is often used by nearly all these writers in a sense about equivalent to *δράμα* (cf. p. 5). Cadmus of Miletus wrote *λόσις ἐρωτικῶν παθῶν* (Suidas). What is meant is not clear; some MSS. omit *παθῶν*, and neither Bernhardt nor Bekker gives it in the text. See Rohde, *Gr. Rom.*, p. 347<sup>1</sup>. Parthenius in his preface speaks of his collection as *ἡ ἀθροῖσις τῶν ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων*. Julian (I, p. 386, ed. Hertlein; cf. Rohde, p. 349<sup>1</sup>) uses the term *ἐρωτικαὶ ὑποθέσεις*; cf. also Phot. cod. 94 (76b, 26), τὸ πάθος τῶν ἀδελφῶν. And elsewhere often.

Λευκίππην καὶ Κλειτοφῶντα λόγοι ἦ. ἔστι δὲ δραματικόν, ἔρωτάς τινας ἀτόπους ἐπεισάγον. Cod. 94, ἀνεγνώθη Ἰαμβλίου δραματικόν, ἔρωτας ὑποκρινόμενον. Cod. 166, ἀνεγνώθησαν Ἀντωνίου Διογένους τῶν ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἀπίστων λόγοι κδ. δραματικόν οἱ λόγοι. If our interpretation is correct, the word implies nothing one way or the other as to the tragedy or comedy character of the events narrated in the works, but states simply that the works are works of adventure — of action about people. The use of certain dramatic expressions in the passages from Photius may be noticed (ὑπεκρίθησαν, ὑποκρινόμενον, ἐπεισάγον), as showing that the word still retained something of its dramatic associations.

What is to be said about the word δραματικόν as found in the rhetorical text-books? The Roman rhetoricians certainly made a division of *narrationes* into *fabula*, *historia*, *argumentum*. The difference between the three terms is clearly stated by Quintilian, Inst. II, 4, 2, *narrationum, excepta qua in causis utimur, tres acceptimus species: fabulam, quae versatur in tragoediis atque carminibus, non a veritate modo, sed etiam a forma veritatis remota; argumentum, quod falsum, sed vero simile comoediae fingunt; historiam, in qua est gestae rei expositio*.<sup>1</sup> The *fabula* is not only fiction, but it has no likeness to the truth. The *argumentum* is fiction, but it has the appearance of truth. The *argumentum* differs from the *fabula* in resembling the truth. Both the *argumentum* and the *fabula* are fiction. Furthermore, the *fabula* is found in *tragoediae*, the *argumentum* in *comoediae*. It is supposed that the Greek equivalents of *fabula*, *historia*, *argumentum* are respectively μυθικόν, ιστορικόν, δραματικόν.<sup>2</sup> The most detailed exposition of διηγήματα is found in Nicolaus, Rhet. Gr. Speng. III, p. 455 f., ἐτι τῶν διηγημάτων τὰ μὲν ἐστι μυθικά, τὰ δὲ ιστορικά, τὰ δὲ πραγματικά, αὐτὰ καὶ δικανικά καλοῦνται, τὰ δὲ πλασματικά. μυθικά μὲν τὰ οὐκ ἀναμφισβητήτως πιστευόμενα, ἀλλ' ἔχοντα καὶ ψεύδους ὑπόνοιαν, οἷα τὰ περὶ Κυκλώπων καὶ Κενταύρων· ιστορικά δὲ τὰ τῶν ὁμολογουμένως γενομένων παλαιῶν πραγμάτων, οἷα

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cic. de Inv. I, 19, 27; Auct. ad Herenn. I, 8, 12; Victorinus, I, 17, p. 199 (Halm. Rh. Lat. Min.).

<sup>2</sup> Rohde, *Gr. Rom.*, p. 351<sup>1</sup>; Susemihl, *Gr. Lit.*, II, p. 574<sup>4</sup>.

τυχὸν τὰ περὶ Ἐπιδάμου· πραγματικά δὲ ἦτοι δικανικά τὰ ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς ἀγῶσι λεγόμενα· πλασματικά δὲ τὰ ἐν ταῖς κωμῳδίαις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις δράμασιν. κοινωνεῖ δὲ τὰ μὲν μυθικά τοῖς μύθοις τῷ ἀμφοτέρω δέσθαι πίστεως· [τὰ δὲ] διαφέρει, ὅτι ὁ μὲν μῦθος [ὁ] τῶν ὁμολογουμένως ψευδῶν, τὰ δὲ μυθικά καὶ παρ' ἄλλων ὡς γεγονότα ἱστοροῦνται, καὶ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἐστὶ καὶ μὴ. ἔτι κοινωνεῖ τὰ πλασματικά τοῖς μύθοις τῷ ἀμφοτέρω πεπλάσθαι, διαφέρει τῷ τὰ μὲν, εἰ καὶ μὴ γέγονεν, ὁμῶς ἔχειν φύσιν γενέσθαι. The πραγματικά or δικανικά are what Quintilian designates as *qua in causis utimur*, and with this class we have nothing to do. ἱστορικά, again, correspond to *historia*. πλασματικά are what are elsewhere called also δραματικά. Etymologically the term would include both the *fabula* and the *argumentum* of Quintilian. Etymologically δραματικά also might refer to the *tragoediae* as well as to the *comoediae*. τὰ μυθικά are explained still further a few passages earlier, where the question is about μῦθοι; p. 452, τούτους δὲ τινες καὶ οὐδὲ μύθους, ἀλλὰ μυθικά ἐκάλεσαν διηγήματα, ἀναμειγνύντες αὐτὰ τοῖς περὶ τῶν μεταμορφώσεων λόγοις καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παραπλησίων. Such διηγήματα as are here called μυθικά are not exclusively and distinctively themes for tragedy. Such themes as τὰ περὶ Κυκλώπων καὶ Κενταύρων do of course appear in tragedies, but it is not easy to believe, without some direct evidence of the fact, that tragedies as a unit were classed as μυθικά and excluded from δραματικά. We are not under the necessity of considering (as Rohde does consider, p. 351<sup>1</sup>) τοῖς ἄλλοις δράμασιν to refer to novels or fictitious narratives. Comedy, as having, at the late period to which Nicolaus belonged, the more vigorous existence, would perhaps naturally come first to his mind and be expressed first. So in another definition of δραματικά a few lines earlier, p. 455, δραματικά δὲ, ὅσα ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ὑποκειμένων προσώπων ἐστὶ μόνον, μὴ παρεμφαινομένου τοῦ συντιθέντος προσώπου, εἴτα τὰ κωμικά πάντα καὶ τραγικά. In the sentence ἔτι κοινωνεῖ τὰ πλασματικά τοῖς μύθοις, etc., Rohde apparently (p. 351<sup>1</sup>) understands τοῖς μύθοις as if it were τοῖς μυθικοῖς. Nicolaus, however, makes a point of distinguishing the two terms. If we understand τὰ πλασματικά to refer to dramatic themes in general (and not exclusively to comedy themes), we are told that comedy themes and tragedy themes resemble μῦθοι in being fictitious, but differ from them in containing matter that is like the truth. The only other rhetor who gives



us the class μυθικά is Hermogenes,<sup>1</sup> Speng. II, p. 4, τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἶναι μυθικόν, τὸ δὲ πλασματικόν ὃ καὶ δραματικόν καλοῦσιν, οἷα τὰ τῶν τραγικῶν, τὸ δὲ ἱστορικόν, τὸ δὲ πολιτικόν. Here we even have the δραματικόν explained as τὰ τῶν τραγικῶν; Rohde (p. 351<sup>1</sup>) would change this to τὰ τῶν κωμικῶν.<sup>2</sup> Other references are as follows: Apthon. Speng. II, p. 22, τοῦ δὲ διηγήματος τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ δραματικόν, τὸ δὲ ἱστορικόν, τὸ δὲ πολιτικόν· καὶ δραματικόν μὲν τὸ πεπλασμένον, ἱστορικόν δὲ τὸ παλαιὸν ἔχον ἀφήγησιν, etc. Anon. Walz. Rhet. I, p. 128, ἐστὶ δὲ τούτου τὸ μὲν δραματικόν ἢ πλασματικόν, τὸ δὲ πολιτικόν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πραγματικόν καὶ δικανικόν, τὸ δὲ ἱστορικόν. Mat. Cam. Walz. I, p. 122, τούτου δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ δραματικόν, ὡς πεπλασμένον, τὸ δὲ ἱστορικόν, τὸ παλαιὸν ἔχον ἀφήγησιν, τὸ δὲ πολιτικόν, etc.<sup>3</sup> Whether the omission of τὸ μυθικόν in these writers is due to simple carelessness, or whether there was felt a tendency to extend the πλασματικόν (δραματικόν) so as to include even the μυθικόν, which Nicolaus says were also fictitious, it is not easy to say. The same omission is found in Sex. Math. I, 252, in Asklep. Myrl., περὶ γραμματικῆς (see Susemihl, II, p. 574<sup>4</sup>): τῆς γὰρ ἱστορίας τὴν μὲν τινα ἀληθῆ εἶναί φησι, τὴν δὲ ψευδῆ, τὴν δὲ ὡς ἀληθῆ, καὶ ἀληθῆ μὲν τὴν πρακτικὴν, ψευδῆ δὲ τὴν περὶ πλάσματα καὶ μύθους, ὡς ἀληθῆ δὲ οἷα ἐστὶν ἡ κωμῳδία καὶ οἱ μῖμοι. Here the ἀληθῆ is τὸ πολιτικόν, and not τὸ ἱστορικόν; the ψευδῆ is οἱ μῦθοι, and not τὸ μυθικόν; the ὡς ἀληθῆ is τὸ δραματικόν. Though Tragedy in this case is not mentioned, it is not necessarily excluded. Similar is Mart. Capell. V, p. 185 (Eyssenh.), *narrationum genera sunt quattuor: historia, fabula, argumentum, negotialis vel iudicialis assertio. historia est ut Livii. fabula neque vera est neque veri similis,*

<sup>1</sup> I purposely omit above the passage Anon. Seguer. Speng. Rh. Gr. I, p. 435 (see Thiele, Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Paed. 147, 1893, p. 407), αὶ μὲν εἰσι βιωτικά, αὶ δὲ ἱστορικά, αὶ δὲ μυθικά, αὶ δὲ περιπετικά, both because δραματικά are not mentioned and because the meaning of some of the other terms is too uncertain. For recent discussions of this passage, I refer to Thiele, 'Aus der Anomia,' Festschrift, Berlin, 1890, p. 124 ff. (not seen); Jahr. f. Phil. u. Paed. 147, 1893, p. 403 ff.; Rohde, Rhein. Mus. 48, 1893, p. 136<sup>2</sup>, 138<sup>1</sup>; K. Bürger, Hermes, 27, 1892, p. 345 ff. Two passages which might be brought to bear on the discussion are Dionys. Thrax, 2, and Schol. to same in Bekk. Anec. II, p. 747. See also Susemihl, II, p. 574<sup>4</sup>. Plutarch wrote μυθικά διηγήματα (Jul. Imp. Orat. VII, 227<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Priscian's translation given below.

<sup>3</sup> Two of these three compilations are virtually epitomes of the third.

ut 'Daphnen in arborem versam.' argumentum est, quod non facta sed quae fieri potuerunt continet, ut in comoediis 'patrem timeri' et 'amari meretricem.' Cicero in the passage already referred to (p. 18<sup>1</sup>), de Inv. I, 19, 27, gives as examples of *fabula*, *historia*, *argumentum*, the following lines respectively:—

'angues ingentes alites, iuncti iugo . . .'

'Appius indixit Karthaginiensibus bellum.'

'Nam is postquam excessit ex ephebis.'

What is meant by *fabula* in all these cases is sufficiently clear, and it is doubtless the truth that more such lines as the first of these three would be found in tragedies than in comedies. It may reasonably be questioned, however, whether the Greek term *δραματικόν* was ever so restricted in its meaning as the Latin term *argumentum* appears in some cases to have been.<sup>1</sup> There is certainly no evidence that such was the case. There is nowhere in the Greek passages a statement to the effect that τὰ μυθικά were τὰ τῶν τραγικῶν, while there are at least two passages (one, to be sure, less certain than the other) in which it is stated that τὰ δραματικά were τὰ τῶν τραγικῶν. Priscian, in his translation of Hermogenes, repeats this statement, Praeexercit. Rhetor. 2, *narratio est expositio rei factae vel quasi factae . . . species autem narrationis quattuor sunt, fabularis, fictilis, historica, civilis. fabularis est ad fabulas supradictas perti-nens. fictilis ad tragoedias sive comoedias ficta. historica, ad res gestas exponendas.*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to find the word *fabula*, which was of course a term of general application, but was applied by the rhetoricians specifically to tragedy themes, used once in direct contrast to *tragoedia*. Apul. Met. X, 2, *iam ergo, lector optime, scito te tragoediam, non fabulam legere.*

<sup>2</sup> After τὸ μυθικόν was applied to that which is both fictitious and impossible and τὸ ιστορικόν to that which has actually happened, we may suppose a need to have been felt for a word to apply to that which lies between the two—the fictitious but possible. τὸ πλασματικόν, the *fictitious*, and, because the fictitious-possible was best known through the drama, τὸ δραματικόν, were the words used. In proportion as things actually impossible found a place in tragedy, to that extent would there be the tendency to restrict τὸ πλασματικόν (and with it τὸ δραματικόν) to comedy. This restriction seems not to have obtained in Greek, as was apparently more or less the case with the corresponding words in Latin. Even if δραματικόν

It does not appear, therefore, that the word *δραματικόν* as used by the Greek rhetors had an exclusive reference to the Comedy. Much less is it probable that the words *δραματικόν* and *δράμα*, as used by Photius in reference to the novelists, had such a restricted meaning. Nor does it seem to be true that the fictitious-possible was what was had in mind. It is not by any means the case that the events described in the novels are always such as resemble the truth (*ἔχειν φύσιν γενέσθαι*). The most noteworthy example of this is the *τῶν ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἀπίστων λόγων* κδ of Antonius Diogenes, which, in common with the erotic novels, is called by Photius *δραματικόν* and *δράματα* (see p. 17). All of the tales therein told were apparently *πλασματικά*, but many of them might very well come under the head of *μυθικά*, as far as their probability or possibility is concerned.<sup>1</sup> The only respect in which they seem to resemble the drama proper is in being descriptive of action.<sup>2</sup> The *δράμα* as thus understood, then, would be a narrative or description of any sort that told about happenings, adventures, whether those happenings were within the bounds of possibility and probability or not; whether they (and the *πρόσωπα*) were pure inventions of the author or not.

---

were so used, it would not necessarily carry *δράμα* with it. *μυθικόν*, as Nicolaus tells us, was something different technically from *μῦθος*. *τὸ πλασματικόν* is not the best word to describe the idea of the fictitious-possible, because it is capable of expressing too much. As a fact the word was used of the fictitious in general. Photius (cod. 90) speaks of some of Libanius's *λόγοι* as *πλασματικοί*, but he of course has nothing in mind resembling either comedy or tragedy. So he may have used *τὸ δραματικόν* in a less technical way than the rhetorical hand-books define it. Cf. Philostr. *Vita Apol.* V, 16, . . . ἄλλὰ τῶν δραματικωτέρων καὶ ὧν οἱ ποιηταὶ θρυλοῦσιν· ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γὰρ Τυφῶ τινα ἢ Ἐγκέλαδον δεδέσθαι φασίν. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Phot. cod. 129, of Lucan and Lucian's *Οἶκος*, γέμει δὲ ὁ ἐκατέρου λόγος *πλασμάτων μὲν μυθικῶν*.

<sup>2</sup> From the recently published fragments of a new Greek novel, U. Wilcken, *Hermes*, 28, 1893, p. 161 ff., a new fact appears. Wilcken finds the greatest difference between this novel and all the rest to be in the traditional character of the plot. P. 185: "Der Held unseres Romanes ist nun nicht eine frei in der Phantasie des Dichters geschaffene Figur, sondern, wie schon bemerkt, kein anderer als der sagenhafte Gründer Nineves." P. 191: "Dass unser Roman keine frei erfundene Fabel hat, ist wohl als der grösste Unterschied von den übrigen zu bezeichnen." Ninos's campaigns are described in detail. Wilcken conjectures that the heroine was Semiramis.

Before passing to the word *θέατρον* it may be worth while to remark that there seems to have been more than one definition of the word *δραματικόν* known to the rhetors themselves. Cf. Nicolaus, Speng. III, p. 455, ἀφηγηματικά μὲν, ὅσα ἀπὸ μόνου τοῦ ἀπαγγέλλοντος προσώπου εἰσὶν, οἷα τὰ παρὰ Πινδάρῳ· δραματικά δέ, ὅσα ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ὑποκειμένων προσώπων ἐστὶ μόνον, μὴ παρεμφαινομένου τοῦ συντιθέντος προσώπου, εἴτα τὰ κωμικὰ πάντα καὶ τραγικά· μικτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐξ ἀμφοῦν τοῦ τε συντιθέντος καὶ τῶν ὑποκειμένων συγκείμενα προσώπων, οἷα τὰ Ἡροδότου καὶ Ὀμήρου. In the earlier literature *δρᾶμα* was of course a word of general application. It may be questioned whether the *μῦθοι δραματικοί* which Nicostratus is said to have composed (Hermog. Speng. Rh. II, p. 420, ὅς γε καὶ μύθους αὐτὸς πολλοὺς ἔπλασεν, οὐκ Αἰσωπέιους μόνον, ἀλλ' οἷους εἶναι πως καὶ δραματικούς) and which Rohde (*Gr. Rom.*, p. 352) apparently considers a sort of incipient novel, were not as likely themes for tragedy as for comedy.<sup>1</sup> One would like to know the nature of the *δράματα* mentioned by Photius, cod. 279 (end), καὶ μὴν καὶ Ξερῆνον γραμματικοῦ ἐν διαφόροις μέτροις δράματα διάφορα. . . . καὶ οὗτος (Andronicus Hermopolites) δὲ δραμάτων ἐστὶ ποιητὴς, διαφόροις μέτροις τοὺς λόγους ἐντείνων. . . . συντίθῃσι δὲ καὶ οὗτος (Horapollon γραμματικός) δράματα τῷ ὁμοίῳ τύπῳ. It is not an impossible supposition that some of them at least were short narrative poems on themes similar to those contained in the collection of Parthenius (praef.: μάλιστα σοὶ δοκῶν ἀρμόττειν, Κορινθίε Γάλλε, τὴν ἀθροισιν τῶν ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων ἀναλεξάμενος ὥς ὅτι μάλιστ' ἐν βραχυτάτοις ἀπέσταλκα. . . . αὐτῷ τε σοὶ παρέσται εἰς ἔπη καὶ ἐλεγείας ἀνάγειν τὰ μάλιστα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀρμόδια . . .). The samples contained in the *προγυμνάσματα* of the rhetoricians also occur to us. I may refer here to an article by O. Immisch in *Rhein. Mus.*, 44, p. 553, on the *δράματα τραγικά* of Pindar. Immisch concludes thus as to the meaning of *δρᾶμα* and *δράματα τραγικά* (p. 557): "Proclus befindet sich dabei ganz innerhalb des von Rohde a. a. O. behandelten Sprachgebrauches, dem zu Folge *δρᾶμα* ursprünglich das 'gefährliche, bedenkliche Ereigniss' selbst, dann aber auch die Darstellung solcher Ereignisse bezeichnet, ähnlich etwa wie unser *aventure*. Wir dürfen also den Satz aufstellen: *δράματα τραγικά*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the passage above from Philostratus, where *μῦθοι δραματικοί* are illustrated.

bedeutet in späterer Zeit nichts als schlechthin Darstellungen von ernsten, ergreifenden oder furchtbaren Stoffen, und wenn wir uns der weitverbreiteten Gleichsetzung von *tragisch* und *heroisch* erinnern, so dürfen wir auch behaupten: Darstellungen heroischen Inhaltes." *δράματα τραγικά*, then, as applied to the poems of Pindar (Suidas s. v. Πίνδαρος), would be descriptive of the character of the contents of the poems (*ibid.* p. 558): "Die fragliche Angabe ist vielmehr eine zusammenfassende Characterisirung der gesamten melischen Dichtungen Pindars. . . ." The reference to Rohde is *Gr. Rom.*, p. 350, but Immisch misunderstands Rohde's position. It is Nicolai who derives the generic use of the word *δράμα* from the meaning 'gefährliches, bedenkliches Ereigniss.' Rohde opposes this view (see p. 3, above). The view that has been suggested here is that *δράμα* signifies a representation of action of any sort, whether tragic or not. There seems almost a tacit acknowledgment that this is so in Immisch's own words, for a distinction is there made between *δράματα* and *δράματα τραγικά*. Why should the adjective *τραγικά* be necessary if *δράματα* itself means representations of 'gefährliche, bedenkliche Ereignisse'? *δράματα κωμικά* are also spoken of; cf. Diog. Laert. IX, 110, of Timon. The passage in Proclus, upon which Immisch lays stress, is Com. in Remp. Plat., p. 53, 5 (Schoell), where Proclus, speaking of the lines in the *Republic* (p. 615c) where the Pamphylian tyrant Ardiaeus is referred to (γέροντά τε πατέρα ἀποκτείνας καὶ πρεσβύτερον ἀδελφὸν καὶ ἄλλα δὴ πολλὰ τε καὶ ἀνόσια εἰργασμένος), says: ὅσα κατατείνει περὶ τῶν ἐν ᾿Αἰδοῦ λήξεων, περὶ τε τὸ στόμιον τὸ μυκώμενον καὶ τὰ τραγικὰ περὶ τὸν ᾿Αρδιαῖον δράματα διατρίβων (cf. p. 57, 34). Immisch calls special attention to the last *περὶ* as tending to show that *δράματα* means not 'die Thaten des Ardiaeus selbst,' but 'das Verweilen Platos bei den von Ardiaeus erzählten furchtbaren Geschichten' (p. 557). It is to be said that the *περὶ* does not make this view a necessary one, as a consideration of two other passages will show. The first is from Proclus, p. 109, 8, where the same Ardiaeus and his *δράματα* are in question: ἐπόμενον δὴ τὰς ἐκ τῶν ὑπογείων τόπων τοῦτο τὸ πάθος ὑπομένειν, διὰ μὲν τὰ ἐν ᾿Αἰδοῦ δράματα καὶ μάλιστα τὰ περὶ τὸν ᾿Αρδιαῖον ἐκτρεπομένης τοὺς τυραννικοὺς βίους, φερομένης δὲ ὁμῶς ὡς αὐχοῦ καὶ κόνεως μεστὰς εἰς τὰς χθονίας ζωὰς καὶ τὴν ἀλογίαν δηλονότι. It is harder to take

τὰ περὶ τὸν Ἀρδιαῖον (δράματα) here as meaning 'the account of the doings of Ardiaeus.' The other passage is Hel. 168, 5, οὕτω τὸ δράμα τὸ περὶ ἡμᾶς εἰς ἀπειρον ἐμηκύνετε, where δράμα cannot mean *narrative*. δράματα τραγικά referred sometimes to the τραγωδία proper, as Demosth., de Falsa Leg. 247, and Aelian, Var. Hist. XIII, 18, and so E. Hiller, Hermes, 21, p. 363, understands the δράματα τραγικά of Timon (Diog. Laert. IX, 110). The βουκολικά δράματα of Theocritus (Suidas, s. v. Μόσχος) are still different (cf. Hiller, p. 362<sup>3</sup>). For the uses of κωμῳδία and τραγωδία see Immisch's article. Attention may be called to the epic poem called *Orestis tragoedia* (Bæhrens, Poet. Lat. Min. V, p. 218 ff.), which is generally thought to have been written by Dracontius. A Greek poem similar to this and having a similar title would doubtless have been called a δράμα.

## 2. θέατρον.

The word θέατρον occurs nine times, and shows some interesting uses. For a general discussion of the various uses of the word in Greek literature, Albert Müller's *Lehrbuch der Griechischen Bühnenallertümer*, p. 48 f., may be consulted.

α) Used of the theatre structure itself, the word occurs 119, 8, καὶ τὸ θέατρον ἐγένετο νυκτερινὸν βουλευτήριον. A place of assembly for the people. In 121, 13, the meeting breaks up and the people prepare for war, τὸ δὲ θέατρον εἰς τὸν πόλεμον διελύετο. Here the word refers accurately not to the building but to those assembled in it. The name is easily transferred, of course, from the building itself to the assemblage. 4.19 4.21

β) The word refers in one instance distinctly to the auditorium. 185, 12, ἡ πόλις δὲ ὥσπερ ἐκ θεάτρον περιεστῶσα τοῦ τείχους ἠθλοθέτει τὴν θέαν. τὴν θέαν is the contest between Thyamis and Petosiris before the walls of the city. The people on the wall are as a row of judges. 7.6

γ) The word is used, as in earlier Greek, of the audience. 97, 13, καὶ φανείσα πᾶν μὲν τὸ θέατρον ἐφ' ἐαυτὴν ἐπέστρεψεν, ἔφθη δὲ τάχα οὐδεὶς τὸν Θεαγέονος ὀφθαλμόν. 4.1

9.6 251, 7, τότε δὴ καὶ οἱ Αἰθίοπες πλησιάζοντες ὥσπερ ἀπ' ἐκκλησίας τῶν πορθμείων πρὸς τὸ πολιορκούμενον θέατρον τοιαύδε ἔλεγον.

It will be noticed that in the latter of these two cases the reference is not to a real audience assembled in a theatre, but to the people of a besieged town who are standing on the walls of the city, waving flags of truce.

d) A. Müller leaves it undecided whether θέατρον was ever used of the play itself or not; p. 49: "Wenn ferner Lexikographen lehren, dass θέατρον auch für *Schauspiel* oder *Theaterstück* stehe, so sind die für diese Bedeutung anzuführenden Stellen derart, dass auch der als der erste aufgestellte Gebrauch des Wortes zugelassen werden kann." The passages from the Lexicographers referred to are Hesych. θέατρον· θέαμα ἢ σύναγμα, and Phot. θεατήρ· ὁ τὸ θέατρον ὁρῶν, ἢ τὸ θέατρον συνιστῶν. The word is used metaphorically of a *spectacle* twice in Heliodorus.

1.1 4, 7, καὶ μυρίον εἶδος ὁ δαίμων ἐπὶ μικροῦ τοῦ χωρίου διεσκέασεν, οἶνον αἵματι μίανας καὶ συμποσίους πόλεμον ἐπιστήσας, φόνους καὶ πότους, σπονδὰς καὶ σφαγὰς ἐπισυνάψας, καὶ τοιοῦτον θέατρον λησταῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἐπιδείξας. οἱ γὰρ δὴ κατὰ τὸ ὅρος θεωροὺς ἑαυτοὺς τῶνδε καθίσαντες οὐδὲ συνίεναι τὴν σκηνὴν ἐδύναντο.

2.1 249, 10, τέλος δὲ τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους ὀρέγοντες τοῖς χώμασιν ἐφιστῶτας καὶ θέατρον τὰ πάθη τὰ ἐκείνων ποιουμένους.

There is one similar passage in Achilles Tatius, I, 16, καὶ τὸ θέατρον ἐπιδεικνύναι τῶν πτερῶν (of a peacock). Liddell and Scott give, 1 Ep. Cor. 4, 9, θέατρον γενηθῆναι = θεατρίζεσθαι.

1.1 c) 77, 28, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ πομπὴ καὶ ὁ σύμπας ἐναγισμὸς ἐτελέσθη — καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἐτελέσθη, πάτερ, ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Κνήμων. ἐμὲ γοῦν οὕτω θεατὴν ὁ σὸς ἐπίστησε λόγος, ἀλλ' εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπερβολὴν ἡττημένοι τῆς ἀκροάσεως καὶ αὐτοκητῆσαι σπεύδοντα τὴν πανήγυριν ὥσπερ κατόπιν ἐορτῆς ἤκοντα, τὸ τοῦ λόγου, παρατρέχεις, ὁμοῦ τε ἀνοίξας καὶ κλείσας τὸ θέατρον.

The question of a curtain in the Greek theatre has been much discussed. See A. Müller, p. 168 ff., and the references there given. There is no passage which obliges us to assume a curtain, and indeed the question would seem to be decided for the theatre of

the 5th century B.C. if we consider the stage as eliminated. Perhaps no further evidence for the general use of a curtain at a later time is needed than the well-known passages in Ovid and Horace and the other Latin authors.<sup>1</sup> The passage given above may point to some device for separating the part of the theatre devoted to the scenery and players from the auditorium. The explanation of the passage is as follows: Kalasiris is describing to Knemon a Delphic festival. He mentions the procession, and is then about to dismiss the subject with the words *ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ πομπή*, etc., and proceed with his story. But Knemon, who wishes to be informed of all the proceedings, interrupts with the words *καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἐτελέσθη*, etc. Kalasiris, in simply touching upon the procession and then dismissing it, has drawn the curtain aside for a moment and then immediately closed it again. Such may be the idea. It is not impossible, however, to understand the passage as referring to the opening of the back scene and the action of the *ἐκκύκλημα*, or even, less specifically, to the opening of the theatre. Of course we could not in any case assume more than that there was something of the sort in Heliodorus's time simply.

ζ) 135, 11, καὶ ἦν ἡ γραφή, παιδαρίσκος ἐποίμαине πρόβατα, χαμαιζήλω μὲν πέτρα πρὸς περιωπὴν ἐφεστώς, τὴν δὲ νομὴν τῇ ἀγέλῃ πλαγίως αὐλήμασι διατάττων. τὰ δὲ ἐπείθετο, ὡς ἐδόκει, καὶ ἠνείχετο πρὸς τὰ ἐνδόσιμα τῆς σύριγγος ποιμαίνόμενα. . . . ἐγγράπτο καὶ ἀρνειῶν ἀπαλὰ σκιρτήματα· καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀγελῆδον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν ἀνατρέχοντες, οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν νομέα κύκλους ἀγερώχους ἐξελίττοντες, ποιμενικὸν θέατρον ἐπεδείκνυσαν τὸν κρημνόν. 5, 14

The position taken by the flute-player during the performance of a play is not known.<sup>2</sup> In the regular cyclic choruses he stood in the centre of the chorus.<sup>3</sup> A. Müller understands the *θυμέλη* in the Greek theatre to be a platform erected for the evolutions of the chorus,<sup>4</sup> though he implies that there was also a platform of some

<sup>1</sup> See Müller, p. 169<sup>3</sup>; cf. Apul. Met. X, 29 (on Grecian soil), and I, 8.

<sup>2</sup> Haigh, *The Attic Theatre*, p. 276.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Wieseler, *Ueber die Thymele des Griech. Theaters*, p. 42, and references.

<sup>4</sup> *Bühnenalt.*, p. 129.



sort for the flute-players and the cithara-players.<sup>1</sup> Apparently, however, he does not look upon this as being in the centre of the orchestra.<sup>2</sup> He opposes O. Müller's view, that the *θυμέλη* was an altar in the centre of the orchestra about which the chorus made its evolutions, and on the steps of which the leader of the chorus took his stand.<sup>3</sup> Pickard, in his *Der Standort der Schauspieler und des Chors im Griechischen Theater des fünften Jahrhunderts*, p. 12 ff., 28 ff., has recently gone back nearer to O. Müller's position.<sup>4</sup> He places the musicians on a part of the *θυμέλη* in the centre of the orchestra. The passage from Heliodorus quoted above is decisive in regard to the position of the *αὐλητής*, though whether it is not an independent cyclic chorus the writer has in mind rather than a dramatic chorus, is not so certain. Heliodorus is describing the workmanship on an amethyst. The youth stands upon a rock, he says, and guides his herds by the music of his flute. The young rams sport about him. Some surge toward the rock, others wheel in circles about it. In so doing, *ποιμενικὸν θέατρον ἐπεδείκνυσαν τὸν κρημνόν*.<sup>5</sup> It is clear that the young rams, running and frisking, suggest to Heliodorus a chorus dancing, but the meaning of *θέατρον* here is peculiar. *ποιμενικὸν θέατρον* cannot be a *pastoral spectacle*; the whole scene, including rock and rams, might be called a spectacle, but hardly the rock alone. The reference cannot be to a stage, for the chorus would perform its evolutions before or on the stage, not round it. The words *ποιμενικὸν θέατρον ἐπεδείκνυσαν τὸν κρημνόν* = 'thereby (*i.e.* by running and jumping and wheeling their circles) they make the rock (for the time being) a pastoral *θέατρον*.' The reference is clearly to a *pulpitum* of some sort, upon which the flute-player took his stand and about which the chorus performed its evolutions. It seems probable that this *pulpitum* was in the centre of the orchestra, and was the *θυμέλη*, or at least some part of the *θυμέλη*. The words of Heliodorus would seem to imply that he had in mind something resembling the cyclic choruses rather than the regular square chorus of the tragedy, but whether an independent cyclic

<sup>1</sup> p. 130, and references.

<sup>2</sup> p. 368<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> p. 131.

<sup>4</sup> So Haigh, p. 132 ff.

<sup>5</sup> We are reminded of the dolphins in Ov. Met. III, 685, *inque chori ludunt speciem*, etc.

chorus or one in conjunction with a play, it is impossible to determine. In any case the passage is pretty clear evidence on the position taken by the flute-player in some choruses in the theatre in the time of the writer. It is perhaps hard to believe that choruses of any sort were so common in the age of Heliodorus as such a reference, applied to his own times, would seem to imply.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, it is hardly conceivable that in an allusion of this sort he could refer to anything that was not more or less familiar to himself and his readers—that he could have in mind a feature that belonged to a period several centuries earlier than himself and was known only as an antiquity. A difficulty arises in connection with the position of the *θυμέλη* in the time of Heliodorus. After the theatre had acquired a stage, the *θυμέλη* came somewhere near the line of division between the stage and the orchestra (see Suidas and Et. Mag. s. v. *σκηνή*). Under such a condition of things, where are we to suppose the flute-player to have stood, when it happened that his services were needed in conjunction with a chorus? Probably still, in any case, in the centre of the chorus.

### 3. *σκηνή*.

The uses of the word *σκηνή* in Heliodorus do not offer much variety. It is used of the 'stage' (or that part of the theatre devoted to the actors) and of a spectacle.

a) For *σκηνή* in general of the 'stage,' see A. Müller, *Bühnenalt.*, p. 53. The following are the passages in Heliodorus:—

44, 22, τὴν δὲ ἀπροσδόκητον τῆς κειμένης ἐπίγνωσιν ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς δαίμονας ἀπεδίδρασκες.

62, 7, καὶ ὥρα σοι τὸ δράμα καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῷ λόγῳ διασκευάζειν.

100, 28, ἡρχόμεν ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῆς ὑποκρίσεως.

132, 20, καὶ τίς ὁ καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἀναγνωρισμός.

284, 22, θυγατέρα ἐμὴν ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἐξ ἀπόρων ἐαυτὴν καὶ οἶον ἐκ μηχανῆς ἀναφαίνουσα.

<sup>1</sup> And yet witness the elaborate chorus and ballet in Apul. Met. X, 29 ff.

It will be observed that the expression is the same in all these passages. Cf. Arist. Poet. 24, 4, τὸ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς . . . μέρος.

δ) In five cases the word means a *spectacle*. This meaning is not recorded by A. Müller, though Liddell and Scott refer to Anth. P. 10, 72; σκηνὴ πᾶς ὁ βίος.

4, 9, καὶ τοιοῦτον θέατρον λησταῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἐπιδείξας. οἱ γὰρ δὴ κατὰ τὸ ὄρος θεωροῦς ἑαυτοὺς τῶνδε καθίσαντες οὐδὲ συνίναί τὴν σκηνὴν ἔδύναντο.

48, 6, σὺ δὲ καὶ διαπόντιος ἦκεις ἑτέραν καθ' ἡμῶν σκηνὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τραγωδήσουσα.

129, 2, ὥσπερ σκηνὴν τὰ ἡμέτερα καὶ δρᾶμα πεποιημένος.

168, 6, οὕτω τὸ δρᾶμα τὸ περὶ ἡμᾶς εἰς ἀπειρον ἐμηκύνετε, καὶ πᾶσαν λοιπὸν σκηνὴν ὑπερφθέγγεται.

175, 18, σκηνῆς τινὸς οὐκ εὐαγοῦς μὲν, ταῖς δὲ Αἰγυπτίαις ἐπιχωριαζούσης θεωρὸς ἐγίνετο.

The idea of *scene* here is not that of scenery, but of the acted drama.

#### 4. λαμπάδιον δράματος.

310, 26, σὲ γοῦν καὶ πάλοι συμβάλλειν ἐχρῆν ὅτι μὴ προσίενται οἱ θεοὶ τὴν εὐτρεπιζομένην θυσίαν, νῦν μὲν τὴν πανόλβιον Χαρίκλειαν ἐξ αὐτῶν σοὶ τῶν βωμῶν θυγατέρα ἀναδείξαντες, καὶ τὸν ταύτης τροφῆα, καθάπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς, ἐκ μέσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐνταῦθα ἀναπέμψαντες, αὐτὴς τὴν πτοίαν καὶ τὸν τάραχον τοῖς προσβωμίοις ἵπποις καὶ βουσὶν ἐπιβάλλοντες, καὶ τὸ διακοπήσεσθαι τὰ τελεώτερα νομιζόμενα τῶν ἱερείων συμβάλλειν παρέχοντες· νῦν τὴν κορωνίδα τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ὥσπερ λαμπάδιον δράματος τὸν νυμφίον τῆς κόρης τουτονὶ τὸν ξένον νεανίαν ἀναφῆναντες.

Charikleia and Theagenes have been taken captive and reserved by the Ethiopian king as a sacrifice to the gods in celebration of his victory in war. The preparations are all completed, and the people assembled. Then a series of unexpected events takes place, which results in the release of the two lovers. Charikleia proves that she is the king's own daughter, who has been exposed, when a child, by the queen, but, having been rescued, has been brought up by the priest Charikles, and is given her freedom. Charikles, who is

supposed to be in Greece, suddenly appears on the scene. A giraffe, which is brought as a present to the king by the representative of one of the neighboring tribes, causes a panic among the horses and oxen which stand ready to be sacrificed. Theagenes shows his strength and skill by quieting a furious steer, and thereby gains the good-will of the people. It appears finally (τὴν κορωνίδα τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ὥσπερ λαμπάδιον δράματος) that Theagenès, whom Charikleia has at first given out to be her brother, is the betrothed of the girl. He is released, and human sacrifice is abandoned for all future time. The words given above are spoken by Sisimithres the priest, who is urging the king to free the prisoner and do away with human sacrifice altogether.

The reference contained in the words λαμπάδιον δράματος is a puzzle. The only attempt at an explanation which I have seen is that made by Koraes in his commentary to the *Aethiopica*, Vol. II, p. 367. Koraes, relying upon a passage in Pollux in which the λαμπάδιον is mentioned as a comic mask, imagines something here not unlike the Commedia dell' Arte of the modern Italians. He supposes that the λαμπάδιον was a character who regularly appeared on the stage at a certain period of the action, toward the close of the play.<sup>1</sup> The passage in Pollux is IV, 151 ff., where the masks of the young women of the Comedy are enumerated and described. They are given in the following order: λεκτική, οὔλη, κόρη, ψευδοκόρη, ἑτέρα ψευδοκόρη, σπαρτοπόλιος λεκτική, παλλακή, ἑταιρικὸν τέλειον, ἑταιρίδιον ὠραῖον, διάχρυσος ἑταίρα, ἑταίρα διάμιτρος, λαμπάδιον, ἄβρα περίκουρος, θεραπαινίδιον παράψηστον. The λαμπάδιον is described thus: τὸ δὲ λαμπάδιον ἰδέαν τριχῶν ἔχει πλέγματος εἰς ὃν ἀπολήγοντος, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ κέκληται.<sup>2</sup> Of course it does not follow that, because

<sup>1</sup> p. 367, ἐκ τῶν τῆς κωμῳδίας προσώπων μετενήκεται τὸ λαμπάδιον· οὐ γὰρ τὸ ὑποκοριστικὸν τῆς λαμπάδος ἐνταῦθα σημαίνει, ἀλλὰ πρόσωπον ἢ οὕτως ὀνομαζόμενον, νέας γυναῖκας, καθὰ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς νεωτέροις, καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς Ἱταλοῖς, εἰσὶ τινὰ πρόσωπα ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις, οὐ τοῖς ὀνόμασι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ, καὶ τῇ μορφῇ, καὶ τῇ στολῇ, ἣν αἱ φέρειν εἰώθασιν, καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ, καθ' ὃν ἐπὶ σκηνῆς προίεται νομίζεται, ἰδιάζοντα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐξηλλαγμένα. ἦν δὲ τὸ λαμπάδιον τῶν ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει τοῦ δράματος παριόντων προσώπων, ὡς γοῦν ἐστὶν εἰκάσει ἐκ τοῦ Πολυδεύκου, ὅς ἐν τῇ καταριθμῇ τῶν κωμικῶν προσώπων πρὸ δύο τῶν τελευταίων αὐτὸ τίθησιν.

<sup>2</sup> So Dindorf. Bekker reads τὸ δὲ λαμπάδιον ἰδέα τριχῶν πλέγματος ἐστὶν εἰς ὃν, etc. The MSS. are at variance. See Dindorf, IV, p. 828.

Pollux mentions the λαμπάδιον near the end of the list, it therefore appeared toward the close of the play. Reasoning thus, we should be justified in assuming that all the characters mentioned appeared in every play and in the order given. Pollux's order seems rather to be based on the relative importance which the characters had, either actually or in his thoughts, or on the relative frequency with which the masks were used. Perhaps all that we can assume here, if we can assume even so much, is that the λαμπάδιον was not one of the most important characters in such plays as it appeared (or was not one of the most frequently used masks), and that it was either a meretrix or a slave-girl. Disregarding, however, Pollux's order, it is quite possible, taking the passage by itself, that Koraes is right, but there is nothing, so far as I know, to recommend this view of the passage except the one reference to the λαμπάδιον in Pollux. We know nothing further about the character, and it is difficult for us to believe that the New Comedy had set characters who appeared at set points in the action.<sup>1</sup> Koraes, after his explanation, acknowledges that he is not quite clear in his mind as to the meaning of the reference, and thinks that perhaps Heliodorus was not clear himself. But, whether this latter was the case or not, the phrase must have meant something to somebody sometime, and it must have had a history. It is possible that the explanation is to be sought in some other direction than in that of the Pollux passage.

Strikingly parallel to the words of Heliodorus is Plut. An Seni Respub. IX (Moralia, 789), ὁ δὲ τὸν ἐμβεβιωκότα πολιτικάς πράξεις καὶ διηγωνισμένον οὐκ ἔων ἐπὶ τὴν δᾶδα καὶ τὴν κορωνίδα τοῦ βίου προελθεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀνακαλούμενος, καὶ κελεύων ὥσπερ ἐξ ὁδοῦ μακρᾶς μεταβαλέσθαι. . . . We can hardly doubt that the explanation of each of these two passages is the same, but of the two explanations of the present passage which I have seen neither seems probable. Liddell and Scott (s. v. δαῖς) render: 'to come to the funeral-torch, i.e. end of life.' Similarly, the translator in *Plutarch's Morals, tr. by several hands, cor. and rev. by Goodwin*, Vol. V, p. 77: 'to go on to his

---

<sup>1</sup> In this connection the Atellan plays of course occur to us, as also a possibly existing variety of the Punch and Judy show. But I know of no evidence that could help us out on the present passage.

funeral torch and the conclusion of his life.' Liddell and Scott further refer to Prop. 4, 12, 46,<sup>1</sup> *viximus insignes inter utramque facem*. The two *torches* here referred to are the marriage torch and the funeral torch, but the passage is far from being parallel to the Greek passages. In the Latin poem the words in question come in quite naturally; the funeral torch has been mentioned in line 10, and the marriage torch in line 33, and the reference to the two torches in line 46 follows quite in order. It is something very different to refer without explanation to a single period of a man's life as *the* torch of life. There would be as much reason to suppose the period referred to was the time of marriage as the time of death. Koraes, in his edition of Plutarch's τὰ πολιτικά, p. 126, remarks that the reference in the Plutarch passage is to the torch-race. It is hard to see how this can be, however, and Koraes vouchsafes no explanation. The expression ἐπὶ τὴν δῆδα is equally inapplicable, whether we understand that in the race the torch was passed from hand to hand, or that the aim was to carry a lighted torch from starting-point to finish without allowing it to be extinguished.<sup>2</sup> Still, though we reject both these explanations, we seem to have made some advance. If the two Greek passages are to receive one explanation, does not the use of the word δαῖς in Plutarch make it certain that Heliodorus's λαμπάδιον was not the mask so called?

Koraes is undoubtedly right in placing the λαμπάδιον δράματος, whatever its nature, near the close of the piece. It may come in as a climax of some sort, or it may be simply a closing feature of the play. Either view would seem to fit the thought of Heliodorus (as well as that of Plutarch). Of course it must be a more or less common feature of the drama; otherwise, its use, as in Heliodorus, would be unintelligible. We are advised by the difficulty of identifying the λαμπάδιον of Heliodorus with the λαμπάδιον of Pollux, as

<sup>1</sup> Paley, 5, 11, 46.

<sup>2</sup> Quite singular, and perhaps more to the point, is the race described in Hel. Bk. IV, chap. 1 ff. Charikleia stands at the end of the race-course with a lighted torch in her left hand and a palm-shoot in her right. Then Theagenes and another start on the run, the contest being apparently to see which shall be the one to snatch the torch from the girl's hand. The palm is the meed of victory.

well as by the Plutarch passage, to go back for an explanation to the theory of a real torch, which Koraes rejects.<sup>1</sup>

The solution may be connected with the solution of another unsolved problem—one itself connected with the illustrated manuscripts of Terence. These manuscripts—the Vatican, the Ambrosian, and the Paris—have preceding each play representations of the masks used in that play, and before each scene a drawing of the characters immediately about to appear. No complete and accurate reprint of these drawings has yet been made,<sup>2</sup> and it is therefore impossible to study them as they should be studied,<sup>3</sup> but samples are given by Seroux d'Agincourt, *Histoire de l'Art par les Monuments*, and by Wieseler, *Theatergebäude und Denkmäler des Bühnenwesens*. D'Agincourt, T. V, Pl. XXXV, 2, and Wieseler, Pl. V, 27, give a selection of the masks which precede the *Phormio*. The selection consists of six masks, and in addition there is a lighted torch. The torch as here given is in the middle, three masks being on each side. How it appears in the manuscripts is uncertain. Mme. Dacier, *Les Comédies de Terence, traduites en François*, Éd. III, T. I (Preface, p. xxxii), says that the torch is beneath the masks and at one side. D'Agincourt had the Vatican MS. before him, Mme. Dacier had the Paris MS. According to one account, the masks follow each other in the MSS. in the order in which the characters enter.<sup>4</sup> What the meaning of the torch is, and why it should appear among the masks,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Λαμπρύπης* and *Λαμπάς* were names of meretrices, Ath. XIII, 583, and Naevius seems to have written a play called *Lampadio* (see Varro, L. L. VII, 107). Cf. the name *Phanium* in the *Phormio*. Menander wrote a play called *Φάνιον* (Ath. XIII, 567). If a character by the name of *Λαμπάδιον* appeared in many plays under similar circumstances, the name might conceivably become a sort of by-word. This is far from probable, however. It may be thought a possibility that the word *δράματος* in Heliodorus refers not to the drama in general, but specifically to the adventures of Theagenes and Charikleia. In that case, *λαμπάδιον δράματος* would mean, not a dramatic torch, but the torch of the action. If this is true, we should expect to read *λαμπάδιον τοῦ δράματος*. Even then, *λαμπάδιον* would still need explanation.

<sup>2</sup> But see p. 43.

<sup>3</sup> For the literature on the subject, see A. Müller, *Bühnenalt.*, p. 199<sup>3</sup>. The publications of De Berger, Fortiguera, and Von Coquelines I have not seen.

<sup>4</sup> Leo, *Rhein. Mus.* XXXVIII, 1883, p. 335<sup>2</sup>.

no one has yet determined. Mme. Dacier (I, Preface, p. xxxii), unable to explain it, concluded that it was not a torch at all, but a pair of flutes. Wieseler (p. 66) thought it might possibly be a Bacchic symbol, but was unable to explain its presence among the masks. Whether Mme. Dacier was right or not in her conjecture, can of course be determined only by an examination of the MSS. themselves. The representation from the Vatican MS. given by d'Agincourt and Wieseler bears no resemblance to a pair of flutes, nor does that given by Mme. Dacier herself from the Paris MS. Wieseler's suggestion would apply rather to the Greek comedy than to the Roman. Simply as a Bacchic symbol and nothing more, we can hardly understand why the torch should appear here. If, however, we can assume that there was some formality of which the torch was a feature connected with the production of a Greek comedy, and that this formality, even though its significance was lost or but indistinctly understood, was transferred and retained upon Roman soil, then the presence of the torch would perhaps become intelligible. Thus, we can imagine that it may have been the custom in the Greek theatre, at the conclusion of a piece, for one or more persons to come forth and make a burnt-offering to the god, or even to march across the orchestra with lighted torch in symbolic reference to Dionysus. The formality, as a formality and nothing more, might then be transferred to Rome. The torch in that case, as having an actual function to perform in connection with the play, would not be so much out of place among the masks. It would be to the end of the piece much as the *prologus* (who also appears in the MSS.) is to the beginning.

It is certainly a coincidence that Pollux mentions a mask called *λαμπάδιον*, and that in these MSS. a torch appears among the masks. It could not very well be the case, however, I imagine, that the torch should be symbolic for the mask called *λαμπάδιον*. There is no reason why, if the mask *λαμπάδιον* is meant, it should not be drawn, like the rest, instead of being expressed symbolically. Moreover, the number of masks represented by Mme. Dacier (thirteen) is the same as the number of speaking characters in the *Phormio* (excluding the *prologus* and the *cantor*). It seems more probable that an actual torch appeared somewhere in con-



nection with the play, either in the course of the action or at the close. A comparison of the Terentian group of masks with several Pompeian groups, reproduced by C. Robert in the *Archäologische Zeitung*, 36, Taf. 3-5 and p. 20, lends support to this view. Pl. III is a representation of four masks used in some play based on the myth of Andromeda, presumably by Euripides.<sup>1</sup> Besides the masks, are represented the head of a sea-monster and, near the mask of Perseus, a short sword and a second article, which Robert makes out to be a wallet. The sword and the wallet undoubtedly appeared in the play as attributes of Perseus. Pl. V, 1 shows, in addition to four masks, a sword and shoulder-strap, a bag, a spear or sceptre, and a staff.<sup>2</sup> The articles are so arranged in the picture as to show the character of the masks. In Pl. V, 2, we find, besides the masks, a cithara and a wine-jar, doubtless attributes of a meretrix.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, in the other groups, more or less stage-property is represented. It is not impossible, therefore, that the torch in the Terence group was used by one of the characters in the play, either as an attribute or at some point in the action.

It is noticeable that the torch appears only in connection with the *Phormio*. How a torch could have any connection with the action of the *Phormio*, or wherein this play differs so greatly from the other plays of Terence, it is hard to understand. If this torch has any connection with the *λαμπάδιον* of Heliodorus, it would seem as though it should be a feature that appears oftener than in one play in six. The fact that it appears in the MSS. but once, however, does not, as Wieseler remarks,<sup>4</sup> exclude the possibility that it belonged to some or all of the other plays as well. It may be mere chance that it appears this once.

But, whether the article depicted in the MSS. is really a torch or only a pair of flutes, and whether it stands in connection with any one of the masks of the piece or is by itself and alone, can be determined only by a careful examination of the MSS. themselves. We can at present only conjecture how a torch may have found a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Robert, *Arch. Zeit.*, 36, p. 13 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Robert, p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Robert, p. 20 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Theatergeb. u. Denkm.*, p. 66.

place in the Comedy. It may, as above suggested, have been brought in at the close of the play as a piece of religious formality. Conceivably it may have been brought in by a dumb character at or near the close as symbolic of the happy marriage of the lovers of the piece. We can believe that enough comedies may have ended in this way to give meaning to the words of Heliodorus.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps the correct explanation of our passages is furnished by reference to the Eleusinian Mysteries.<sup>2</sup> The proceedings in these Mysteries constituted a *δρᾶμα*,<sup>3</sup> and an important feature of the *δρᾶμα* was the appearance, toward the end, of a sudden light out of darkness. I give at some length, as being worthy of notice, the passages bearing on this latter point. Themist. in Stob. Flor., 120, 28 (Meineke, IV, 107), *τότε δὲ πάσχει πάθος οἷον οἱ τελεταῖς μεγάλας κατοργαζόμενοι. . . . πλάναι τὰ πρῶτα καὶ περιδρομαὶ κοπῶδεις καὶ διὰ σκότους τινὲς ὑποπτοὶ πορεύαι καὶ ἀτέλειστοι, εἴτα πρὸ τοῦ τέλους αὐτοῦ τὰ δεινὰ πάντα, φρίκη καὶ τρόμος καὶ ἰδρῶς καὶ θάμβος · ἐκ δὲ τούτου φῶς τι θαυμάσιον ἀπήντησε. . . .* Plut. de Prof. in Virt. X. (p. 81<sup>c</sup>), *ὡς γὰρ οἱ τελούμενοι κατ' ἀρχὰς ἐν θορύβῳ καὶ βοῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὠθοῦμενοι συνίασι, δρωμένων δὲ καὶ δεικνυμένων τῶν ἱερῶν, προσέχουσιν ἤδη μετὰ φόβου καὶ σιωπῆς · οὕτω καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἐν ἀρχῇ. . . . ὁ δ' ἐντὸς γενόμενος, καὶ φῶς μέγα ἰδὼν. . . .* Cf. Themist. Or. XX, p. 235<sup>b</sup>, *ἥ τε ὁμίχλη ἐκείνη καὶ τὸ νέφος ἀθρώως ὑπερρήγγντο καὶ ἐξεφαίνετο ὁ νοῦς ἐκ τοῦ βάθους, φέγγους ἀνάπλεως καὶ ἀγλαίας ἀντὶ τοῦ προτέρου σκότου, Ἀφροδίτη δὲ παρὴν δαδουχοῦντι. . . .* Apul. Met. XI, 23, *accessi confinium mortis et calcato Proserpinae limine per omnia vectus elementa remeavi, nocte media vidi solem candido coruscantem lumine, deos inferos et deos superos accessi coram.* Mention is often made in connection with the proceedings of torches and of the official called *δαδοῦχος*.<sup>4</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> The word we should rather expect, perhaps, of a real torch brought on the stage, is *λαμπάς*, and not *λαμπάδιον*. Still the use of the diminutive is not at all an insuperable objection to the theory.

<sup>2</sup> This explanation was suggested to me by Prof. F. D. Allen.

<sup>3</sup> Clem. Alex. Protrep. p. 9 (Heinsius, ed. 1688), *Διὸς δὲ καὶ Κόρης, δρᾶμα ἦδη ἐγενέσθην μυστικόν · καὶ τὴν πλάνην καὶ τὴν ἀρπαγὴν καὶ τὸ πένθος αὐτῶν Ἐλευσίς δαδουχεῖ. Homer. Hymn. in Dem. 477, *δρημοσύνην θ' ἱερῶν*. Arist. Eleus. I, p. 256, *τὰ δρώμενα*. Plut. Profect. in Virt. X, p. 81, *δρωμένων*. And elsewhere.*

<sup>4</sup> Aristid. I, p. 520; Lib. IV, 189; etc.

δαδουχία seems to have been a grade.<sup>1</sup> And yet the passages above quoted would seem to suggest that some part of the initiation proceedings was characterized by the use of torches and the presence of a great light. So, the critical point of a man's life might very well come to be referred to as the δαίς of his life, and the climax of a δράμα such as that described by Heliodorus, would, we may imagine, be likened to a λαμπάδιον δράματος. This theory has not a little to say for itself, inasmuch as phrases and words which are derived from religious customs and observances are just the sort of things which are apt to get into the everyday language and to stick when once there.

And here I will leave this question at present. It is possible that similar phrases to those of Heliodorus and Plutarch are to be found in the late authors, Greek or Latin, but I have as yet found none such.<sup>2</sup>

#### 5. προαναφώνησις, προεισόδιον.

244, 10, καὶ ἦν ὥσπερ ἐν δράματι προαναφώνησις καὶ προεισόδιον τὸ γινόμενον.

For discussions of this passage, I refer to A. Müller, *Bühnenalterthümer*, p. 366, and Rohde, *Rhein. Mus.* 38, p. 265 ff.

#### 6. ἐπεισκυκλέω.

63, 7, ἐπεισόδιον δὴ τοῦτο, οὐδέν φασι πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον, ἐπεισκυκλήσας.

The technical word for 'rolling' a person into the presence of the spectators was ἐκκυκλέω: *Ar. Thesm.* 95; *Ach.* 408, 409. The

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Theo. Smyrn. *Math.* I, p. 18 (Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* I, p. 38).

<sup>2</sup> I will make mention of one further idea that has occurred to me. The fact that the word *κορωνίς* is used by both Heliodorus and Plutarch, combined with the further fact that there was apparently a something called *κορωνίς* which was of the nature of a closing flourish to book or chapter, suggests that the *λαμπάδιον* may also have been a scroll of some sort. For the *κορωνίς*, consult Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, pp. 102, 444, 468; Schwarz, *de ornamentis librorum apud veteres usitatiss.*, 2d dissertation, paragraph xvi.

opposite of this action was of course expressed by *εἰσκυκλέω*: Ar. Thesm. 265. This technical use of the words probably continued as long as the theatre continued. Cf. Philost. Vit. Ap. VI, 11, p. 245, . . . ἦν ἐς τὸ πρόσφορον Ἴνδοι στείλαντες ἐφ' ὑψηλῆς τε καὶ θείας μηχανῆς ἐκκυκλοῦσιν (not, of course, of the ἐκκύκλημα proper). Clem. Alex. Protrep. p. 9, τοὺς . . . θεοὺς . . . οἷον ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τοῦ βίου . . . ἐκκυκλήσω.<sup>1</sup> Sometimes, however, the words were used less technically, and the point of view taken was rather that of the auditorium than that of the σκηνή. So *εἰσκυκλέω* is often used much like *ἐκκυκλέω*, and that as early as Lucian at least. Cf. Luc. Philops. 29, καὶ τὸ τοῦ λόγου, θεὸν ἀπὸ μηχανῆς ἐπισκυκληθῆναί μοι τοῦτον ἔμην ὑπὸ τῆς τύχης. The change is of course quite natural. The word is used similarly by Aristophanes himself where the reference is not directly to the theatre; cf. Ar. Vesp. 1475. Then often metaphorically: Luc. de hist. cons., 13; deor. conc., 9; Ath. VI, 100; etc. Pollux calls the machine on which the ἐκκύκλημα rolled, the *εἰσκύκλημα* (IV, 128).

#### 7. *παρεγκύκλημα*.

186, 28, ἕτερον ἐγένετο *παρεγκύκλημα* τοῦ δράματος ἢ *Χαρίκλεια*.

This passage has been discussed by A. Müller, Philol. 23, p. 331<sup>49</sup>. Cf. also Droysen, Quaest. de Arist. re scaen., p. 25 ff.

#### 8. *ἐπεισόδιον*.

Heliodorus uses the word *ἐπεισόδιον* three times, each time of an action or narrative which forms a whole by itself and may be looked upon as a sort of digression or interruption to the main action or narrative. So in 63, 7, ἔλαθες γάρ με μικροῦ καὶ εἰς πέρας τῷ λόγῳ διαβιβάζων, *ἐπεισόδιον* δὴ τοῦτο, οὐδέν φασι πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον, *ἐπισκυκλήσας*, the *ἐπεισόδιον* is a digression from the main story. In 11, 26, οὐκ ἐν καιρῷ γένοιτ' ἂν *ἐπεισόδιον* ὑμῖν τῶν ὑμετέρων τὰ ἐμὰ *ἐπισφέρειν*

<sup>1</sup> Heinsius reads *ἐγκυκλήσω*, but *ἐκκυκλέω* and *ἐκκύκλημα* are often written with a γ in the MSS. Cf. A. Müller, *Bühnenalt.*, p. 147<sup>2</sup>. This is due perhaps to a confusion of sound combined with a change in the point of view similar to that mentioned above.

κακά, Knemon's narrative is referred to. In 185, 15, καινὸν ἐπεισόδιον ἐπετραγώδει τοῖς δρωμένοις, ὥσπερ εἰς ἀνταγώνισμα δράματος ἀρχὴν ἄλλου παρεισφύρουσα, the scene is the fight about the walls, which is pictured in the writer's mind as a stage action (cf. 185, 12, ἡ πόλις δὲ ὥσπερ ἐκ θεάτρων, etc.). ἐπεισόδιον refers to the turn given to affairs by the unexpected arrival of Kalasiris. Heliodorus seems, however, to have been not quite clear in his mind as to what he wished to say; ἀρχὴν ἄλλου <δράματος> is something quite different from ἐπεισόδιον. Can we believe, as the words would seem to suggest, that there were still ἀγῶνες at the time? For further evidence on ἀγῶνες in the time of the Emperors, see A. Müller, *Bühnenalt.*, p. 313 ff.

#### 9. τραγώδεω.

τραγώδεω is used once, quite regularly in the sense *to represent*.

48, 6, ἑτέραν καθ' ἡμῶν σκηνὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τραγώδῃσιν.

#### 10. ἐπιτραγώδεω.

a) ἐπιτραγώδεω is used, as elsewhere in late Greek, meaning *to utter in a tragic manner, to rant*.

6, 25, ἡ μὲν ταῦτα ἐπετραγώδει. 198, 17, ἡ δὲ ἐπετραγώδει.

The reference in each case is to a long tragic lamentation.

b) Elsewhere the ἐπι- has the force of *in addition*.

69, 7, ἐπετραγώδει τοῦτῳ τῷ δράματι καὶ ἕτερον πάθος ὁ δαίμων. 185, 15, καινὸν ἐπεισόδιον ἐπετραγώδει τοῖς δρωμένοις.

#### 11. τραγικός.

The word presents no uncommon uses.

a) 129, 4, ὥσπερ σκηνὴν τὰ ἡμέτερα καὶ δράμα πεποιημένος. τί οὖν οὐχ ὑποτέμνομεν αὐτοῦ τὴν τραγικὴν ταύτην ποιήσιν;

b) 187, 22, καὶ ἀγὼν ὁ δι' αἵματος κριθήσεσθαι προσδοκώμενος εἰς κωμικὸν ἐκ τραγικοῦ τὸ τέλος κατέστρεφε.

The reference is to the hand-to-hand contest, which, instead of turning out seriously, had an unexpectedly happy ending. *κωμικόν* = having such an ending as comedies have, *i.e.*, a happy ending.

c) 194, 18, εἰ τὸ τραγικὸν τῆς οἰκήσεως καὶ ὑπέρογκον καὶ πρὸς κακοῦ γενησόμενον αὐτοῖς ὑπείδοντο.

The house to which the lovers were conveyed was destined to play an unfortunate part in their lives.

d) 41, 17, τραγικὸν τι καὶ γοερὸν . . . βρυχώμενος.

## 12. τραγωδός.

11, 25, τὸ τῶν τραγωδῶν.

## 13. κωμωδία.

62, 5, ὁ Διόνυσος . . . χαίρει μύθοις καὶ κωμωδίας φιλεῖ.

Mention has already been made of this passage above (p. 7).

## 14. κωμικός.

187, 22, εἰς κωμικὸν ἐκ τραγικοῦ. See above, under *τραγικός*.

## 15. προσωπεῖον.

259, 13, ὅψιν ἀνδρὸς εἰς ἀκρίβειαν ὥσπερ τὰ προσωπεῖα σοφίζόμενον.  
64, 23, οἷον ἐπὶ προσωπεῖον αὐτὴν ὑπῆλθε (ὁ δαίμων). 286, 7, ὥσπερ προσωπεῖον τῇ κόρῃ ταῦτα περιθείς ἐντρυφῇ.

The idea in the last two passages is that of the god working through the agency and under the disguise of a person.

## 16. σκηνογραφέω.

310, 11, ὁρμῆς θείας, ἣ σύμπαντα ταῦτα ἐσκηνογράφησεν.

The word here means *represented as on the stage*. It is the only case known to me in which the word has this meaning, though

it is not unlikely that it occurs elsewhere. The use is quite parallel to σκηνή used of a *spectacle*, noticed above (p. 30). Similar is σκηνογραφική, following.

### 17. σκηνογραφική.

187, 20, σκηνογραφικῆς ἐπληροῦτο θαυματουργίας.

The people, as they looked at the scene passing before them, were filled with admiration and wonder, as if they were the spectators of a grand spectacle in the theatre.

### 18. σκηνοποιία.

289, 10, οὐ μὴν εἰς τὸ παντελὲς γε ἐξεκροίσθη τῶν πρακτέων, ἀλλ' ὀλίγον ἐπιστάς. τὸν τε δῆμον κατοπτεῖσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἴσων παθῶν κινημένον, καὶ πρὸς τὴν σκηνοποιίαν τῆς τύχης ἰφ' ἡδονῆς τε ἅμα καὶ ἑλέου δακρύνοντας. . . .

Liddell and Scott explain the word thus: '*frequent change of fortune*, as if she was one of a nomad tribe.' σκηνοποιία sometimes means *tent-pitching*, as in Polyb. 6, 28, 3, ἔστι δ' ἡ τε τῶν ἱππέων καὶ τῶν πεζῶν σκηνοποιία παραπλήσιος. It seems more likely, however, in the present case that the word refers to the fondness of τύχη for making of the lives of mortals a theatrical spectacle. In Julian, Or. VII, p. 216 D, the word means a *theatrical display*: μετὰ τῆς μύθων σκηνοποιίας. Cf. also 217 A. τύχη plays a prominent part in all the Greek novels; cf. Rohde, *Gr. Rom.*, p. 276 ff., 378<sup>1</sup>, 436<sup>2</sup>, etc. Also the δαίμων. Both the δαίμων and τύχη are conceived of as the moving agencies of δράματα; e.g. Hel. 69, 7, ἐπετραγῶδει τοῦτω τῷ δράματι καὶ ἕτερον πάθος ὁ δαίμων, and Ach. Tat., I, 3, ἤρχετο τοῦ δράματος ἡ τύχη. Cf. also Chariton, IV, 4, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ φιλόκαινος τύχη δρᾶμα σκυθρωπὸν ὑμῖν περιτέθεικε. . . . The figure was probably a familiar one. It occurs again in the Byzantine historian Theophylactus, IV, 6, φέρειν τῆς ἀπαισίου τύχης τὰ δράματα.<sup>1</sup> Heliodorus gives no evidence of a fondness for military metaphors.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Theod. Prod. VI, 180; VIII, 379, 493; Plut. de Gen. Socr. 30 (Moralia, 596).

19. μηχανή.

μηχανή is used, as elsewhere, of a sudden or unexpected event. The passages follow :

45, 10, καθάπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς. 133, 22, καθάπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς. 185, 18, ὥσπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς. 270, 18, καθάπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς. 281, 26, ἐκ τινος μηχανῆς. 284, 23, οἶον ἐκ μηχανῆς. 310, 30, καθάπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς.

---

**Note to Page 34.**

Since this article was printed, the Classical Department of Harvard University has received a complete set of photographs of the Vatican miniatures illustrating the *Phormio*. These miniatures are reproduced in the libretto (*Terenti Phormio*, translated by M. H. Morgan, Cambridge, 1894) to the Latin play recently brought out in Sanders Theatre, Cambridge. By the courtesy of the Department, I am enabled to say from personal examination of the original photographs that the article which Mme. Dacier conjectured to be a pair of flutes, is (as far at least as the Vatican MS. is concerned) without the least doubt a torch, and not a pair of flutes ; and that the torch, as represented in the armarium, is by itself on the lowest shelf and nearly beneath the middle of the shelf above.





## NOTES ON THE BACCHAE OF EURIPIDES.

BY MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

### 1. Vv. 13-24.

λιπὼν δὲ Λυδῶν τοὺς πολυχρύσους γύας  
 Φρυγῶν τε Περσῶν θ' ἡλιοβλήτους πλάκας  
 15 Βάκτριά τε τείχη τήν τε δύσχιμον χθόνα  
 Μήδων ἐπελθὼν Ἀραβίαν τ' εὐδαίμονα  
 Ἀσίαν τε πᾶσαν, ἣ παρ' ἄλμυρὰν ἄλα  
 κεῖται μιγάσιν Ἑλλήσι βαρβάροις θ' ὁμοῦ  
 πλήρεις ἔχουσα καλλιπυργώτους πόλεις,  
 20 εἰς τήνδε πρῶτον ἦλθον Ἑλλήνων πόλιν,  
 καὶ κεῖ χορεύσας καὶ καταστήσας ἐμὰς  
 τελέτας, ἵν' εἶην ἐμφανῶς δαίμων βροτοῖς.  
 πρῶτας δὲ Θήβας τῇσδε γῆς Ἑλληνίδος  
 ἀνωλόλυξα κτέ.

Pierson's conjecture that v. 20 should stand between vv. 22 and 23 has met with considerable favor. It brings in its train, if accepted, Wecklein's natural and necessary change of ἐπελθὼν to ἐπῆλθον in v. 16 (with the omission of θ' after Περσῶν in v. 14), and of πόλιν to χθόνα in v. 20. It is easy to see how χθόνα was corrupted to πόλιν when v. 20 came to stand after v. 19. Furthermore, πρῶτον in v. 20 should surely be changed to πρώτην, unless we assume, after v. 22, a lacuna of a verse or verses in which a second action of Dionysus was described. Such an assumption is, however, highly improbable; for not only is Pierson's transposition intrinsically plausible, but it can be supported from another passage in the Bacchae, vv. 481 sq.:

ΠΕ. ἦλθες δὲ πρῶτα δεῦρ' ἄγων τὸν δαίμονα;  
 ΔΙ. πᾶς ἀναχορεύει βαρβάρων τὰδ' ὄργια.

In v. 481 ἦλθες πρῶτα δεῦρο = εἰς τήνδε πρώτην ἦλθες χθόνα — an obvious reminiscence of v. 20; while v. 482 is an echo of vv. 21 sq. (ἀναχορεύει = χορεύσας, ὄργια = τελετάς).



at this energy on the part of the blind old seer (v. 191), "Shall we not then take some conveyance to the mountain (= Surely you don't intend to go on foot)?" Tiresias objects (v. 192): "But we shouldn't be paying as much honor to the god (as if we went on foot)." Cadmus, still unwilling (v. 193): "Am *I* to lead *you*, old as we are, as if I were your παιδαγωγός?" To which Tiresias reassuringly (v. 194): "It will be no labor, for the god will guide us thither." Then the dancing is again touched upon (v. 195), and Cadmus at length gives in (v. 197). A parallel to the question in v. 193 is afforded by the somewhat similar scene in the *Heraklidae*, where the servant says to old Iolaus (v. 729), ἡ παιδαγωγεῖν γὰρ τὸν ὀπλίτην χρεών;

## 6. Vv. 210 sq.

ἐπεὶ σὺ φέγγος, Τειρεσία, τόδ' οὐχ ὀράεις,  
ἐγὼ προφήτης σοι λόγων γενήσομαι.

προφήτης σοι λόγων cannot, I feel, be right. προφήτης, in its proper sense, is to be found in v. 551. The genitive with it should represent the person (god) whose mouthpiece the προφήτης is. Instead then of προφήτης σοι λόγων, I propose προσηγητήρ λόγων "guide in words," comparing προσηγητήρα συμφορᾶς in v. 1159. As used in respect of a blind man, προσηγητήρ, without a special term in the genitive, would mean προσηγητήρ ὁδοῦ (or κελεύθου); cf. the use of προσηγητής in Sophocles, *Ant.* 990, *O. T.* 1292. Euripides has προσηγητήρ of a blind man's guide in the *Phoenix*, frag. 813, 2.

## 7. V. 440.

ἔμενέ τε τοῦμόν ἐπρεπὲς ποιούμενος.

Professor Tyrrell adheres to the reading of the MSS. here. "The middle with a pred. adj. must mean *making for one's self*. Now, as Dionysus was at least as much interested as the servant in the *seemliness* of the arrest, there seems no reason why we should desert the MSS., 'turning for himself my task to seemliness.'" With this I agree so far as ἐπρεπὲς ποιούμενος is concerned; τοῦμόν, however,

seems harsh in such a context. I would, therefore, (without any reference to Professor Tyrrell's "my task"), correct τοῦργον.

## 8. Vv. 460 sq.

πρῶτον μὲν οὖν μοι λέξον ὅστις εἰ γένος.

ΔΙ. οὐ κόμπος οὐδὲς ῥαίδιον δ' εἰπὲν τόδε.

οὐ κόμπος is obviously corrupt. Boasting is not opposed to ease of any kind. The error, which arose from illegibility and wrong division of letters, is to be corrected by writing οὐκ ὄγκος οὐδαίς. Cf. Soph. *O. C.* 1162, βραχύν τιν' αἰτᾷ μῦθον οὐκ ὄγκου πλείων. For the general expression, cf. Demosthenes, VI, 4, ῥαίδιον καὶ πόνος οὐδαίς πρόσσεστι τῷ πράγματι, and *Bacch.* 613, ῥαιδίως ἀνευ πόνου.

## 9. V. 688.

θηρᾶν καθ' ὕλην Κύπριν ἡρημωμένας.

This verse is very awkward and disturbing after v. 687. It seems to have been added, with reference to vv. 222 sq., by some one who wanted to bring the two passages into closer agreement.

## 10. Vv. 1088 sq.

ὁ δ' αὖθις ἐπεκέλευσεν · ὥς δ' ἐγνώρισαν  
σαφή (? σαφῶς) κελευσμὸν Βακχίου Κάδμου κόραι, κτέ.

ἐπεκέλευσεν followed in the next verse by κελευσμὸν is at least noticeable. Perhaps Euripides may have so written; I suspect, however, that he wrote ἐπεθύωξεν, the future of which occurs in *I. T.* 1127, though in a different context. In favor of ἐπεθύωξεν here, followed (in vv. 1090 sq.) by ἦξαν πελείας ὠκύτηγ' οὐχ ἥσσονα (em. Heath) | ποδῶν ἔχουσαι συντόνοις δρομήμασι, are the words (vv. 871 sq.) θωύσσων δὲ κυναγέτας | συντείνῃσι δρόμημα κυνῶν. Cf. also vv. 1188-91, and Soph. *O. C.* 1623-5.

## NOTES ON LYSIAS.

BY M. H. MORGAN.

### VII, 39.

ὅσῳ γὰρ οἱ τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν ἐπαιτιώτατοι καὶ ἀπορώτατοι τῶν κινδύνων,  
τοσούτῳ πάντες αὐτοὺς φεύγουσι μάλιστα.

The meaning of ἐπαιτιώτατοι has passed without mention in all the commentaries except those of Shuckburgh and Kocks. The German's note is 'um so mehr Schuld und Verlegenheit aus ihnen erwächst u. s. w.' Shuckburgh's is 'ἐπαίτιος properly means *held to blame for*, but here it appears to mean *calculated to attach blame*.' Both of these editors seem to have the right idea, for the point deserving of notice is that ἐπαίτιος is here active in sense. Hence the passage means 'the more blame such suits cause (that is, the more invidious they are) and the more perplexing they are, so much the more all avoid them.' On the face of it, there seems to be no reason why ἐπαίτιος should not have an active as well as a passive meaning (cf. ἐπιζήμιος, active, e.g. in Thuc. I, 32, passive in Plat. Legg. 765 A.); but the active sense is not entered in our dictionaries, and the passive so predominates that Shuckburgh is led to call it the 'proper' meaning. Yet the active occurs also in Thuc. V, 65, 2, τῆς ἐξ Ἀργεῶν ἐπαιτίου ἀναχωρήσεως, 'the retreat which had caused him (Agis) to be blamed' (Fowler, after Classen, who refers back to Thucydides's statement in 60, 2, ἐν αἰτίᾳ δ' ἔχον κατ' ἀλλήλους πολλῇ τὸν Ἄγιν, and to the same effect about the same retreat in 63, 1). These two passages from Lysias and Thucydides are the only ones in which the adjective is active or causal, and also the only ones in which it agrees with a common, not a proper, noun.

The word itself seems familiar enough, yet it is of somewhat rare occurrence. I find it in only nine<sup>1</sup> other places in the authors, and

<sup>1</sup> In Xen. Anab. III, 1, 5 I follow Hug in reading ἐπαίτιον.

in them all it is passive. Its earliest occurrence serves to show the meaning in all the rest. This is Hom. A 335 :

οὐ τί μοι ὕμνες ἐπαίτιοι, ἀλλ' Ἀγαμέμνων.

The others are Aesch. *Eum.* 465, 467 ; Eur. *Hipp.* 1383 ; Thuc. VI, 61, 1 ; Ap. Rhod. I, 414 ; II, 614 ; Plut. *Comp. Dion. c. Brut.* 2 ; Nonnus, *Dionys.* VII, 59.

There is, however, the following curious gloss in *Lex. Seguer.* (Bekker, *Anecd.* p. 188, 5) : ἐπαιτιώτατοι συκοφάνται. From the rarity of the adjective, occurring, as it apparently does, only once in the orators, one feels almost inclined to think that the gloss must refer to the passage in Lysias. Yet, if it does (and always provided that the gloss contains the right interpretation), τοιοῦτοι refers to συκοφάνται, and then it seems hardly possible to keep τῶν κινδύνων. There is a strong temptation to strike out these two words and to read ὅσῳ γὰρ οἱ τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν ἐπαιτιώτατοι καὶ ἀπορώτατοι, τοσούτω πάντες αὐτοὺς φεύγουσι μάλιστα, 'the more culpable and hard to deal with (for ἀπορώτατοι used of accusers in just this sense, cf. Plat. *Apol.* 18 D) such men are, so much the more all avoid them.' The rhythm of the sentence would then be a little better ; but for the absolute use of ἐπαίτιος (without a genitive or adverbial modifier) the only parallel is Thuc. V, 65, quoted above ; and there ἐπαίτιος is active.

## XII.

The new Aristotle *On the Constitution of Athens* seems to me to make it clear that the twelfth oration was delivered by Lysias at the εὐθυνα of Eratosthenes, and not at a trial for murder. When Lysias returned to Athens from exile, he found there the very man through whose agency his brother Polemarchus had been delivered over to the Thirty for execution. Eratosthenes had not gone to Eleusis under the terms of the amnesty (stated in Arist. *Resp. Ath.* XXXIX) ; for, once there, he could not have been brought back to answer such a charge as Lysias had to make. Even if past murders are included under the provision in *Resp. Ath.* XXXIX, τὰς δὲ δίκας τοῦ φόνου εἶναι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια εἰ τίς τινα αὐτόχειρ ἀπέκτεινεν ἢ ἔτρωσεν, this

would not apply to Eratosthenes; for he had not killed Polemarchus with his own hand. And however doubtful the rest of the text is here (I have followed Sandys), we must read αὐτόχειρ or a word of similar meaning, like αὐτοχειρί or αὐτοχειρία. Staying on, as Eratosthenes did in Athens, he must have known that charges would be brought against him by his enemies, and hence he would avail himself as soon as possible of that clause in the amnesty by which those of the Thirty who chose to submit their accounts of office, were no longer liable to attacks for the past. This would have been the easiest way once and for all to have done with those who had anything against him. Fuhr and Gebauer in their editions have held (as against Blass, *Att. Bereds.* I<sup>2</sup>, p. 540 ff., Meier and Schoemann, p. 257 f., Weidner in his edition) that Eratosthenes was tried for murder at the Palladion. Their strongest argument is that there is no direct mention of εὐθυναί in the text. But, as Blass points out, the same sort of argument is equally strong against them; for Lysias, in the first part of his speech, makes almost as much of the pillage of his property as he does of the execution of his brother, and he does not even mention Polemarchus in his recapitulation at the end. To this argument I would add that the action of Archinus (*Arist. Resp. Ath.* XL) in persuading the Senate to put to death without a trial a person who had broken the oath μὴ μνησικακεῖν, and the salutary results of that action, make it extremely doubtful whether the partisans of the Thirty were at this time brought to court in any cases except those of εὐθυναί.

Since I have referred to the oath μὴ μνησικακεῖν, I may add that it has sometimes been thought (following Luebbert, *de amnestia*) that this oath was not sworn to until after the final overthrow of the Thirty in Eleusis, as described by Xen. *Hellen.* II, 4, 43. But Aristotle (*Resp. Ath.* XL), διελύθησαν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Ἐλευσίνι κατοικήσαντας ἔτι τρίτῳ μετὰ τὴν ἐξοίκησιν, ἐπὶ Ξενοκλέους ἀρχοντος shows that this final overthrow did not occur until two years (401-400 B.C.) after the democracy was restored. Hence Xenophon, unless absolutely at fault, can only refer to a reaffirmation of this oath. It cannot be supposed that the trial of Eratosthenes took place so late as this.



## XII, 16.

τριῶν δὲ θυρῶν οὐσῶν.

It is impossible to identify these doors with certainty. We do not know how elaborate was the house of Damnippus inside, although we know that it ran from one street back to another (ἀμφίθυρος, § 15). Nor do we know where Lysias and Damnippus had their hurried talk (§ 14). They may have been in the αὐλή, for Lysias may simply have called D. to him as he stood among the other prisoners; or they may have stepped into one of the rooms which opened from the αὐλή; or they may even have passed the μέταυλος θύρα. Nothing is known of D., but he appears to have been trusted by the Thirty, as they were using his house, and he does not seem to have been a prisoner. Theognis and his men were guarding the front door (§ 16), and if they allowed Lysias to speak to D. at all they might have let them go together into a room. Or Lysias may have originally been thrust into a room. The editors of Lysias do not seem to appreciate the uncertainties of the case, and they are too offhand in their explanation of what these three doors were. The following all seem to me to be *possible* explanations:—

I. (Supposing that L. and D. talked in the αὐλή): 1, the μέταυλος; 2, door from the house to the garden, κηπαία θύρα (if D.'s house had a garden); 3, from the garden to the back street.

II. (The explanation of Fuhr and Frohberger): 1, the door of the room in which Lysias was imprisoned (but I see no reason for being sure that D.'s house had *doors* to the rooms instead of *curtains*; cf. Hermann, *Gr. Privatalt.*, 3d ed., p. 156, A. 1); 2, the μέταυλος; 3, door from house to street.

III. 1, μέταυλος; 2, door into one of the working-rooms, ἱστῶνες; 3, door into the street.

IV. (If L. and D. had passed the μέταυλος): 1, into the ἱστῶνες; 2, into the garden; 3, into the street.

## XII, 44.

οὕτως . . . ἐπεβουλευέσθε ὅπως μήτ' ἀγαθὸν μηδὲν ψηφιεῖσθε πολλῶν  
τε ἐνδεεῖς ἔσεσθε.

Weber (p. 163) takes the future indic. here as in a final clause ; hence it would fall under Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, 324. But is it not rather an *object* clause? Cf. Aesch. III, 64 f, where we certainly have object clauses.

## XII, 60.

μισθωσάμενοι δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐπ' ὀλίθρῳ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ὅλας  
πόλεις ἐπάγοντες καὶ τελευτῶντες Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ τῶν συμμάχων  
ὁπόσους ἐδύναντο πείσαι κτλ.

Chapter XXXVIII of Aristotle's *Resp. Ath.* makes some corrections necessary in previous explanations of Lysias. Hitherto it has been supposed that πόλεις referred to the cities of the Spartan allies, who (except the Boeotians and Corinthians) followed Pausanias when his jealousy of Lysander led him to Athens (Xen. *Hellen.* II, 4, 30). But Aristotle says that the Ten<sup>1</sup> who succeeded the Thirty had already fallen before the arrival of Pausanias, and that they were succeeded by a second Ten, who had begun negotiations for peace with the patriots in Peiraeus before Pausanias came. (Lysias and the other authors do not mention this second Ten.<sup>2</sup>) The forces, therefore, that aided the first Ten were Lysander, with his mercenaries (Xen. *Hellen.* II. 4, 28 f., in number 1,000, according to Diod.

<sup>1</sup> Why was not Eratosthenes one of this first Ten (§ 55)? Was it because Phidon and his associates were not really of the party of Theramenes, but held still a middle ground between this party and that of Critias, while Eratosthenes belonged to Theramenes out and out? Or was it because Phidon and his colleagues were real followers of the Thirty, chosen by a trick on the people? If the latter is the true explanation, Eratosthenes, as a known opponent of the advanced party in the Thirty, would not have been chosen into this Ten.

<sup>2</sup> Their existence, however, is confirmed, as Sandys says, by Isocr. XVIII, 6, ῥίτων, εἰς τῶν δέκα γερόμενος; for Aristotle mentions Rhinon as the leader of the second Ten.

Sic. XIV, 33), and his brother Libys with a fleet (Xen. *ibid.*; of 40 ships, Diod. Sic. *ibid.*). Aristotle does not here mention either of these by name, but says only that the first Ten were helped by Callibius and the Peloponnesians then at hand, together with some of the knights. Callibius was the harmost, sent with a garrison (of 700, according to Arist. XXXVII) to maintain the Thirty. By Πελοποννησίων τῶν παρόντων Aristotle may mean what was left of this garrison, or he may mean Lysander and Libys with their forces, or both. Lysias is evidently speaking loosely of what was done under the two Tens. For μισθωσάμενοι cannot truthfully be used of the second, nor πόλεις ἐπάγοντες of the first; while the words Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ τῶν συμμάχων . . . πείσαι belong properly to the expedition of Pausanias, who was not summoned by either Ten so far as we know (least of all by the first!). Finally, the following words, οὐ διαλλάξαι ἀλλ' ἀπολίσσαι παρεσκευάζοντο can refer only to the first Ten, the second having actually begun to negotiate before Pausanias arrived. Hence the second may well be included under the ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί (παρεσκευάζοντο τὴν πόλιν εἰ μὴ δι' ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς).

These ἄνδρες, according to the editors of Lysias, were the avowed or secret friends of Athens in Argos, Thebes, Corinth, and elsewhere, as well as all who were jealous of Lysander. But the patriots of Peiraeus too are meant, and now we must add the second Ten and their supporters in the ἄστυ.

## XII, 65.

In speaking of the πρόβουλοι Lysias says that Theramenes στρατηγὸς ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἤρέθη; but it does not appear from any author that the πρόβουλοι had power to fill any of the offices. Theramenes, one of the Four Hundred, was nominated and chosen general by the Four Hundred themselves; Arist. *ibid.* XXX.

## XII, 77.

τοῖς εἰρημένοις τρόποις ὑπ' ἐμοῦ αὐτοῖς αἴτιος γεγενημένος.

On the unusual order editors have compared Dem. XIX, 174, τὴν μὲν γραφεύσαν ἐπιστολὴν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ. See also Frohberger's critical

note in his large edition. Lysias has the substantive following the participle in XIII, 43, τὰς γεγενημένας συμφορὰς τῇ πόλει. But in our passage I think that the unusual order of ὑπ' ἐμοῦ is to be defended, not by any general principle, but that it is here rendered necessary for clearness in order to separate αὐτοῖς, which follows, from τρόποις.

## XVI, 6.

ἐπειδὴ γὰρ κατήλθετε, ἐψηφίσασθε τοὺς φυλάρχους ἀπενεγκεῖν τοὺς ἱππεύσαντας, ἵνα τὰς καταστάσεις ἀναπράττητε παρ' αὐτῶν.

Here the MS. has ἀναπράττηται, and the *vulgate* before Scheibe was ἀναπράττητε. Of recent editors only Jebb and Shuckburgh retain the *vulgate*, but they seem to me to be right, for it is near the reading of the MS., and in its tense (G., *M. T.* 87) it denotes the repeated number of cases which would arise after the report of the phylarchs had *once for all* (ἀπενεγκεῖν, *aorist*) been made. Lysias is very careful in observing this distinction between the present and the aor. subjv. or opt. The final clauses cited from him by Weber (*Entwick. der Absichtssätze*, p. 160 ff.) all bear out the rule in G., *M. T.* (save the only apparent exceptions in which εἶδητε and ἐπίστησθε appear). This is particularly well illustrated in XII, 72, and XXXII, 22, where both tenses are used in the same sentence. Fuhr reads ἀναπράξῃτε (schedae Brulart.), cf. Harp. s. v. κατὰστασις; so Weber himself, p. 162. Sauppe and Weidner, ἀναπράξαιτε.

## XVI, 7.

καίτοι ῥάδιον τοῦτο γινῶναι ὅτι ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τοῖς φυλάρχοις, εἰ μὴ ἀποδείξειαν τοὺς ἔχοντας τὰς καταστάσεις, αὐτοῖς ζημιοῦσθαι.

Here αὐτοῖς is dat., in spite of its nearness to the inf., because of φυλάρχοις, which belongs closely to the impersonal phrase ἀναγκαῖον ἦν; cf. Andoc. II, 7, and my note in *Harvard Classical Studies*, II, p. 58. Below, in ἐν ἐκείνοις δὲ τοὺς ἱππεύσαντας ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ὑπὸ τῶν φυλάρχων ἀπενεχθῆναι, the participle ἱππεύσαντας could not be dative, in spite of its nearness to the impersonal, on account of the pre-

ceding *ἐκείνοις*. The other instances of the use of this impersonal in Lysias are *μοί ἐστι λέγειν*, XVII, 1. and *ἀναγκαιότατον* ff. in XII, 9, where the *μοι* belongs to *ἰδόκει*. As for the impersonal phrase with *ἀνάγκη*, Krüger's remark (*Spr.* 62, 1, Anm. 3) that *ἐστὶ* very rarely occurs with this word, holds good for Lysias. *Ἀνάγκη* occurs twelve times; with *ἐστὶ* twice, XIII, 92, 44 (but in the latter there is no inf.); without *ἐστὶ* seven times, IV, 8, X, 5, XII, 1, XIX, 1, 3, XXII, 7, XXVI, 6; with *ἦν* twice, XIII, 79; XXXIII, 4; with *γένηται* once, XXXII, 1. Only in the last passage is the dative used with the phrase, and it is inserted between *ἀνάγκη* and its verb. Cf. the usage of Andocides, noted in the *Studies*, II, p. 57.

## EARLY LATIN PROSODY.

By J. B. GREENOUGH.

THE profound researches of Müller and others in early Latin prosody have only served to settle the metrical conditions under which certain long syllables are shortened. They have done nothing, systematic at least, to show how the shortening was accomplished. In fact, Corssen's treatment, and perhaps something of Wagner on the *Aulularia*, are practically the only discussions that have had that end in view. That their theories as well as those of the ancient grammarians are unsound, at least in the form in which they are stated, seems obvious. They all proceed upon the idea that every consonant had half a χρόνος (*mora*), so that a short vowel, having one *mora*, with two consonants, each having a half, makes two *morae* or a long syllable. This is nothing but a mechanical interpretation of the usage of the later poets, and seems obviously absurd. It mistakes the whole nature of position, as I hope to show later. The effect of position could not possibly be explained on any such mechanical theory as this. It seems clear enough that the early Latin poets, in fitting a dramatic text—that is, a body of Latin conversation—to definite forms of Greek metre, must have followed pretty closely the spoken language of their day. That is what all poets do, except so far as they are ruled by conventional forms previously established, such as that which in English allows *said* to rhyme with *blade*. There could hardly have been any such conventions in the time of the early Latin poetry. The text of the plays is the text of speech, and must have been recognizable as such by the hearers. But the poet has two privileges; he may, in the first place, choose either one of two varieties of speech, which are current in the ever-changing fashions of enunciation, that suits his purpose. The poet can say, for instance, either *peremptory* or *péremptōry*. So the Latin poet could say *omnibus* or *omnibu'*, according to the quantity which he wanted. In the second place,

he may force words slightly, according to the exigencies of his metre, if he does not go so far as to make them unintelligible. Thus I am at liberty to make *real*, *prayer*, and *fire* two syllables, or *heaven* one, because those forms are near enough to the common speech to be felt as not distorted. These two kinds of liberties are just what the Latin poet took with his text; farther than this it seems impossible that he should have gone. Hence, in discussing the subject, our view must be made to conform to the possibilities at least of contemporaneous speech, and should make the usages of speech, and not the mechanical rules, the criterion.

On this line I propose to examine what happened when, according to the metrical rules established beyond controversy, Plautus or any other early poet shortened (as we say) a syllable which in the later language, and often in his own works, elsewhere, was treated as long.

In the case of vowels long by nature, there is no difficulty; some part of a homogeneous quantity can easily be retrenched. But what happened in the case of syllables ordinarily long by position? To answer this question, we must determine what lengthening by position really was. As I intimated above, the idea that a consonant has a definite vocal length, is evidently absurd. The explosives certainly have no metrical duration; the fricatives may or may not have. They may be treated as explosives, or they may be metrically continued; but there is no indication that they were so continued in Latin.

I might, perhaps, except the vowels before *ns*, *nf*, and *gn*, in which the lengthening seems to have been due to a prolongation of the following consonant; but these exceptions rest on other principles and make no difference.

So, in order to understand what position is, it is necessary to review the exact nature of articulation. We ordinarily think of letters or sounds as distinct entities, which are put together to make words, each having a separate value in time. This is not strictly true. Very few of the letters are capable of being pronounced alone; and, where they are so capable, they are in actual speech so interlocked that one is not added to another, but dovetailed into it. Let us examine a mute, for instance. It consists of two parts—

first, a stoppage of a previously existing stream of breath by an arrangement of the organs which is characteristic for each letter (*an implosion*); second, a loosening of this stop (*an explosion*). A fricative or continuous consonant has the same two parts produced in the same manner, except that the stoppage is not complete, but so loose as to allow the breath to escape during the time of the stop. But the putting on and taking off of the stop, or the beginning and cessation of the breath, or in some cases the occurrence of another stop, answer the same purpose as the implosion and explosion of the mutes.

So much for a single element of speech. But the elements essentially never occur alone; two or more are always practically connected together. In the case of a mute, it is preceded or followed (sometimes both) by some other sound. If this accompanying sound is a continuous one, as a vowel or continuous (fricative) consonant, the closure (or implosion) is so adjusted that it becomes the end of the previous stream of breath (either pure or fricative). Thus the implosion, which would otherwise be the end of an unformed stream of breath, becomes, in case of a fricative, the end of the fricative consonant; and, in case of a vowel, the end of the vowel. This implosion may be immediately followed by an explosion without any other character than that given by the mute itself, as in *fat*; in this case, we have the end of a word or sound-group. Or, on the other hand, the explosion may be modified, as the implosion was, by some formation of the vocal organs which is suited to produce some other sound, as in *fatness*; in this case, the explosion *is* the *n*-sound. It is not followed by it, but the same stream that rushes out makes the *n*. If, however, the following sound is itself a mute, the position of the closure is so changed at or after the instant of implosion, that the explosion is that of the new mute, and not that of the first one. The same statements are true of sounds other than mutes, except that in these the closure is only partial, so that the stream does not strictly explode, but is only diverted. But as the diversion must consist of some opening and shutting (usually simultaneous), the effect of an explosion is produced, although the stream does not, strictly speaking, stop, unless we purposely repress the breath, as we can always do. It will be observed



that all this is or may be continuous, so that there really need be no syllabification except through a new voluntary impulse of breath. Thus, in such a word as *strength*, we may (and usually do) make it felt as only one syllable, but we also may (but do not) make it consist of two, or even six. We may mark by a new impulse (often a mere increase) of diaphragmatic contraction either element of the compound sound which we usually pronounce with one impulse; thus we can say, *s-trength*, *st-rength*, *str-ength*, *stre-ngth*, *stren-g-th*, and children in their early efforts often do thus divide syllables. In fact this word really has two syllables, though the first, consisting of *s* alone, is not felt to be a syllable according to our (conventional) division.

In regard to doubled consonants, — that is, two consonants of the same kind, — nobody ordinarily really pronounces them in English except in two successive words. We can say, *the rat turned on the cat*, in which case the first *t* has an implosion and a neutral (if I may call it so) explosion — a dull vowel sound; but we (in English) are not likely to make it, unless we have some special occasion to pause between the words. We usually connect the two words more closely. If we pause at all, instead of finishing the first *t* with an explosion, we dwell an instant after the implosion in the stopped position, and then explode on the next sonant, whatever that may be (here the *ur*). This is what the Italian does habitually whenever a doubled consonant presents itself; in English, we do not do it in a single word, though we usually do it between two words. It is unquestionable that the Romans did the same thing with two consonants in the same word as do the Italians. We say *a-tain* (for *attain*), but the Romans said *at-tinet*, as the Italians say *tut-ti*. Now it was just this pause between the explosion and the implosion that made position. In fact, if we consider what I have said before, this was the only possible thing that could make it.

So quantity by position is really a matter of syllabification, connected with this pause of which I have spoken. It depends upon a method of dividing syllables which, to the English ear, is essentially unfamiliar. I discovered this many years ago, when I happened for the first time to hear, under circumstances that made a lasting impression, an Italian enunciation. The word *dotes-to* in

*Lucretia Borgia* remained in my ear, so that, when later I began to ask what position meant, this articulation presented itself as the answer. I suppose that now this doctrine is generally received, but I doubt whether many persons have so worked it into their views of phonetics that they understand all its effects and corollaries. This true nature of position shows itself in several different phenomena of ancient prosody. The first is the prosodical effect of a mute and a liquid. Why was a syllable with this combination common? It is evident that it was because two forms of enunciation were possible and customary. A Roman could make the first syllable of *pātris* either long or short. An Englishman cannot, without bad pronunciation, do the same with *patrimony*. Why not? Evidently because we do not mark the division of syllables forcibly enough to be conscious of any difference between *pā-tris* and *pat-ris*; but in Italian the difference is marked with absolute certainty. The only possible explanation is that the Roman enunciation was like the Italian, and in fact like that of all the other Mediterranean nations. A Roman could say *pā-tris*, in which case the syllable was short; or he could say *pat-ris*, in which case the marked stop between the two consonants, *i.e.*, the fact that the *t* did not explode immediately into the *r*, but was retained a perceptible instant, made the syllable long. In Plautus's time they always said *pā-tris*, and consequently a mute and liquid never lengthened a syllable otherwise short.

Another plain indication of the nature of position is found in the fact that the ancient grammarians were troubled by the *u* following *q* or *g*. This letter could not be a vowel, because it did not make a new syllable; nor could it be a consonant, because it did not make position. They did not know the true nature of position, and of course they went wrong. But their error shows that when the *u* was a part of the syllable begun by the *q* or the *g*, as we have seen it may well be, it of course did not make position. A *u* COULD make position if it began a new syllable, as in *egressus vada*; but if it was in the same syllable, as in *male suada*, it did not.

It is in the light of this doctrine I have set forth that the early Latin prosody by position is here to be discussed; and my idea roughly stated is that when the early Romans pronounced as we do, position disappeared, but when they pronounced as the modern

Italians do, there was position. This, of course, is a very crude statement, and to maintain it we must examine the cases in detail. Essentially, all the cases of shortening depend on one general principle. The Romans of the period in question had a dislike (we may call it) to a succession of sounds in dissyllables, in which a short accented syllable was followed by a long accented one. They could have (in speech, I mean) dissyllables like *lǎ lǎ*, *lǎ lǎ*, or *lǎ lǎ*, but not *lǎ lā*. The other, *lǎ lǎ*, they did not have by their laws of accent. We may compare the odd sound of the syncopated measure in waltz-time, as it is often used for variety *lǎ lǎ | lǎ lǎ*. It seems to us an unnatural movement, and we feel relieved when the regular cadence is restored. So the Romans evidently felt, and, therefore, they began to say *dǎmǐ*, instead of *dǎmī* and the like. Many words got a permanent slant in this direction, like *cave*, *vale*, *vide*, *puta*, though in general the proper quantity was afterwards restored, at least in poetry. This feeling also extended to two monosyllables in connected discourse, to the first syllable of a longer word when it followed a monosyllable, and also to any two syllables preceding the accent in a four-syllable word. Such a shortened syllable has never either word-accent or ictus, except in a few cases at the beginning of a verse. That the shortening is analogous to the clipping of words in lively, strongly-accented and rapid utterance, seems sufficiently obvious. The question is to know just what elements, if any, disappeared in utterance; or, where none absolutely disappeared, what method of pronunciation destroyed the effect of position. The principle laid down by Corssen, that what was written by the people was also spoken, and that we are not authorized to omit any sound which was represented at the time in question by written characters, is, in the main, correct, but has undoubtedly some exceptions, which we shall note as we proceed.

From what has been said, it is not to be expected that any one principle should explain the details of all cases. It is of the nature of such shortenings, under the influence of accent and hurried speech, that each combination of sounds should follow its own laws. The change is not an intended nor a conscious one, and the sounds adjust themselves to the convenience of the organs.

Without going over the whole of Plautus, I have got together all the combinations (so to speak) in which position is neglected, from Müller's *Plautinische Prosodie*. As he gives all suggested readings which involve the principle, together with comments, and on a plan entirely distinct from the one I have in mind, his collection seems sufficient for the purpose. To these I have added the list given by Corssen. In going over these, I hope to provide for all known cases. I assume, of course, that the regular metrical conditions now universally admitted are suitable for the shortening.

a. The first case is the recognized inscriptional suppression of *s* after a short vowel. This needs no example nor comment.

b. This principle will apply without forcing to a long vowel as well, when that vowel is shortened by the Iambic rule, as *fōrās sum egressus, sī te hābēs cārum, hābēs quod faciās, adferre iūbēs lorīcam, vīrīs cum sūmmis*. Only about five or six are noted, but probably more could be found.

c. The next usage that is confirmed by inscriptions is the suppression of final *m*: *bōnūm sodalem, decēm sī ad cenam, enī m verō* (and *enī m vēro*) very often; so *malum, quidem*, and many others. In these two cases the letter simply disappeared.

d. (1) Less supported by documents is the loss of *t* at the end of the third persons singular and plural of verbs. There is only one word (in these places) showing this loss before the second Punic war, and that word is evidently dialectic: *dede* (Lanuvium and Pisaurum), while the city inscriptions show the *t* preserved. The loss of *t* in the third plural of the perfect, found along with the full form, is proved by official inscriptions of that age: *dedro* (Pisaurum), *censuere* (Sen. Con. de Bacch.). The Pompeian graffiti show the loss of the *t* in several places. Thus *quisquis ama perea*, etc., shows that this writer at least did not hear the *t* at the end of the word, though other people did. We may add to this the fact that the loss is universal in the Umbrian, Volscan, Sabellian, and Faliscan. The loss is common also in late Latin. This seems to show that there must have been a tendency to drop the *t*, or at least assimilate it, constantly increasing among the common people, till it finally crowded out

the *t* altogether, except in special cases before a vowel, in the Romance languages. And here comes in a limitation of the dictum of Corssen above set forth. Writing does represent speech, but it does not always represent the real speech of the writer, and certainly not the contemporaneous speech of other persons. A man who can write at all, is always influenced in his writing by the written copies which he has followed. Take such an expression as *good-bye*. Unless we examine very carefully, we imagine that we say the words in the form in which we know them to exist. We know the word is *good*, and we think we say it so; but, as a fact, very few persons do say it so without an effort. We vary between *good-bye*, *goob-býe*, and *guh-bý*. We may suppose the Roman did the same with *habet*. He knew that it ended in the consonant sound, because he usually said it last, with no occasion to clip it, and would write *habet cor*; but he would no doubt read it *habecor*, unless he had the careful Italian articulation, on which, as I have said before, I conceive position to depend.

(2) This usage in verbs applies also to *est*, which (in composition) is one of the commonest words to be shortened. In our speech, *hoc est corpus* becomes *hoco-scórpus*, and, given the shortening, which nobody doubts, this enunciation seems the most natural, and in fact the only way to effect it. The Roman could say *hoc ést corpús* if his metre or his emphasis required it, and then we should have position; but he could also — and the common people doubtless did, more or less — say the other, and there would be none. Cf. the famous *cauneas* for the character of their speech. No better proof, for the possibility at least, of this can be found than in *atque* becoming *ac*. So we have *agít grátíás*, *amät ne*, *decët servom*, *dedýt dono*, *agünt céteri*, *amënt Pseudole*, *abëst perduto*, *adëst benignitas*, *potëst quin*. In these cases, when the *t* was lost, the other principles that I shall discuss later would come in to apply to the remaining consonants, as *agun(t) céteri*, *abes-(t) perduto*. This is one of the commonest usages, occurring everywhere. Under this same principle may come a very few common words like *caput*, *apud*, *id*, *ad*, *at*, *et*, which are often found shortened.

*e*. Doubled consonants can at any time be treated as single ones. As is well known, the writing of doubled consonants came in only

in the time of Ennius. Of course, it does not follow that because only one was written that two were not pronounced; in fact, it is certain that they were usually pronounced double. Now what is a doubled consonant? It is not in any language that I know strictly a doubled one, as I have shown. We can pronounce two, as we do in *rat-trap*; but our usual way, even where two seem to be present, is to pronounce the implosion of one and the explosion of the other. And so also in other languages.

In the case of a single consonant the explosion follows immediately on the implosion, without any delay between; this is our English method of pronouncing what we call doubled consonants, except in such words as *rat-trap*, — we only pronounce one in fact. In the case of a real doubled consonant, an appreciable stop between the implosion and the explosion is made; this is the Italian method of pronouncing two like consonants. In view of what was said before, it is evident that the factor which makes position is the pause between the implosion and the explosion. A Roman, in order to make position, must have pronounced his two consonants in the Italian manner.

We have no direct evidence that the Romans neglected this pause, but such forms as *operio*, *aperio*, *oportet*, show that doubled consonants must very early have given place in certain cases to single ones, so that the phenomenon of reducing the two to one could not have been absolutely strange to the language. And, again, this seems the most natural, or rather the only possible way of accomplishing the purpose. This class is extremely numerous. Examples are *in occultis iacebis*, *per opprēssionem*, *ea adfinitatem*, *savia māmīllae*, *ēgo ēsse nolo*.

*f.* Closely connected with the last usage is the tendency of final consonants by the universal laws of *Sandhi* to become assimilated to the following initial. Monumental evidence of this tendency is not extensive, but seems sufficient, as *at tegulas*, C. I. L., I, 252; *quic quid*, C. I. L., I, 200; *apsolvere*, C. I. L., I, 603. So Cicero's *cun nobis*, and *etian nunc*, Velius Longus, p. 22, 36, etc.; so also *occl̄do*, *occl̄asio*, found very early.

In cases of entire assimilation, the assimilated doubled consonants would naturally be treated like original ones: *ad foris* (*afforis*,

*ā-foris*), *ut contingat* (*ucontingat*, *u-contingat*), *ād tris viros*, *eho ān libera*.

g. Thus far, all the cases of shortening imply loss; but, if I am right in my definition of the real nature of position, there are many cases in which no loss would be required to prevent the effect of position by two consonants. As we have seen, even an Augustan poet could say *sentētia scripto* in dactylic verse, which shows that there was no potent charm about two consonants, or three for that matter.

This effect (or rather non-effect) of two consonants in a following word is enough to show clearly that a Roman in Plautus's time, probably at any time, *could* pronounce consonants either in the Italian way or in the English way. He could say *detes-to*, or he could say *dete-sto*. In the first case there would be position, and in the second case there would be none. Now we know that in Plautus we find that sometimes the second syllable of *magistratus* was long, and sometimes it was short. I see no more natural way of making this variety—almost no other way at all—than the one plainly indicated in *telā scandite* and *sententiā scripto* respectively; that is, at one time it was *magis-tratus*, at another *magi-stratus*.

This principle (of possible initials) applies to a very considerable number of cases. Among the various combinations occurring, to which this treatment seems applicable, *i.e.*, those in which we have no reason at all to suspect assimilation and consequent loss, or those in which assimilation or loss seems doubtful, we have various degrees of certainty. The combinations *st* (including *str*), *sp* (including *spr*), *sc* (including *sq*, *scr*, and *scī*), *dv* and *gn*, as being found beginning Latin words, hardly need any comment. The Romans could and did pronounce them as beginning a syllable, and even in later poetry, when so beginning a following word, they are found without position.

With hardly a less degree of certainty, we may assume *pt*, *ps*, and *x*, as being found beginning Greek words used by Plautus, as *Pterelas*, *Pseudolus*, *xystilis*. With *pt* thus established, we may group *bt*, which would inevitably become *pt*, and with much probability *bd*, as being of the same sort and a regular Greek initial group. The

combination *ts* may be tolerably well supported by *z*, which is found in *zona* and the like; but it is perhaps better to assume, as more consonant with Latin usage, assimilation and loss (*ts*, *ss*, *s*). The combinations *mn*, *dm*, *cm*, *sm*, *sn*, though evidently harsh to Roman ears, really come under the mute and liquid rule; and, in view of the fact that such shortenings are incontestable, we may assume that, just as a Frenchman in the opera-bouffe makes his words fit his music in *utterance*, — not by any rule, — so the Roman *histrion* made these combinations without position when the metre required it. And, if I am right in the view of position above expressed, the only way this could be done was by making these combinations begin a syllable with such slurring (in this case of the first element) as was necessary. And it is to be noticed here that what a man thinks he hears or speaks in ordinary language, is not a safe guide to the actual utterance. Few of our British friends would recognize the *k*-less and *r*-less character of their speech. But the main thing is that a consonant has or has not in speech its distinct 'syllabic' utterance, whether we notice it (and so write it) or not. As I have tried to show above, in pronouncing combinations of consonant elements, the organs do not work by machinery with separate clicks at determined intervals, but continuously, so that after the implosion of a mute or the beginning of a fricative the position for the next sound is already preparing. Let any one try to pronounce *acme*, and notice what goes on in his organs of speech. He will find that before the *k*-sound explodes, the nasal position for the *m* is already formed, so that when the explosion comes, it is not a pure *k*-explosion, but is an explosive *m*. The explosion of the *k* is the *m*, and does not precede it. The difference between the Italian method of pronunciation and the English is that the same pause that I have spoken of in regard to doubled consonants is made between the *k*-implosion and the *m*-explosion. What I have called a syllabic utterance requires that there shall be this perceptible pause between the two. That this was the usual later pronunciation of the Romans there can be no doubt; but it is equally clear that they could use the other, from their use of *cŷnus* with its first syllable short, and also from the proper names *Gnaeus* and *Mnestheus*.



The only combinations that do not come under this principle that I can find, are *cp* in *Quid hic Pamphilus*, and *bst* in *abstineo*, etc. These almost necessarily require a sacrifice of one of the elements. The second is justified by *ostendo*, where the *b* is lost and the combination brought into line with the natural Latin initials. For the first I have no suggestion, except that of possible loss of *c*. The cases are few, but too numerous to be emended out.

h. There is another class of cases of an entirely different character from those above set forth. One of the commonest cases of neglect of position is that in which a liquid *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, precedes instead of following the mute. The tendency to shortening is so strong in this case that a few common words, such as *inde*, *unde*, *nempe*, are subject to it outside the Iambic rule. These special cases seem so nearly parallel to the use with *ille*, *ipse*, *iste*, especially from the fact that these also begin the verse, thus shortening the first syllable instead of the second, that one is tempted to try the same principle with these; that is, either make the combinations begin the syllable, or, second, suppress one consonant. But we have hardly any reason to suspect loss, and though some of the combinations are initial in some languages, there is no indication that they or any of them were so in Latin. A more likely supposition is that the liquids were vocalized, *i.e.*, that instead of vowel + liquid the syllable weakened into a sonant vowel. The process would be precisely what happens in English with *heaven*, *evil*. There are many others in English, but *these* particular ones are noticeable because, in ecclesiastical language, the last syllable has still its full vowel and consonant; but in common speech it is only a liquid vowel. That this was at some time a Latin mode of pronunciation appears from *ager*, *acer*, which could only get their later form through a sonant vowel (vocalized liquid) stage.

The forms *facul*, *simul*, also have the appearance of development from such sonant forms. Perhaps *hercle* is also the result of a corruption in the same line. Of course, there are many forms which must have sprung from vocalized liquids in the Indo-European; but we have no indication that such sounds survived till Plautus's time, though there is nothing distinctly to the contrary. Some

forms in which the shortening occurs, seem difficult to pronounce in this manner. *Soror* and *feror* present, to my tongue at least, great difficulty. They *can* be pronounced, however, by practice, and are perhaps not more troublesome than *terror* in English, to which they would be exactly analogous. The other liquids present no difficulty in pronunciation, but we have no proof that such sounds were ever used by the Romans. *Nempe* would have the sound that we give to the same combination in *an imperial theme*; *inde* and *unde* would, however, in this way be confounded. I know of no case of this form of shortening that cannot be thus accounted for, if we had sufficient evidence that this sort of vowel was used in Plautus's time. Thus, *habēt si, agūnt ceteri*. Here *t* was lost, as in other cases, and then vocalization took place. So in *hānc nōstram, ferēntarius*, etc. In *datū soleas* the *n* might be lost before *s*. The character of many words in which the enclitic *ne* has lost its vowel, and the commonness of this phenomenon, tend somewhat to show a shortening of this kind, *i.e.*, the peculiar form of the syllable shortened, as in *iubēsne me*, shows some peculiar affection analogous to our clipped words, *gōn t' Boston, ĩnt' town, six hits ofū Carter*.

A fourth possibility is that the division of syllables, which, as we have seen above, made position, was neglected. Here again we have the difference between Italian and English pronunciation. In *morto* we notice the same pause between the syllables that we saw in the case of two like consonants; in *mortar* we do not pause. In the latter case there is a continuous flow of sound, and we cannot say whether we divide after the *r* or the *t*. We know there are two syllables, because there are two distinct expulsions or efforts, but which letter belongs to the first, and which to the second, it is impossible to tell, unless we purposely make the division in one place or the other. In order to make position, as we have seen, the Romans must have made the division perceptible. They must have said *opor-tet, feren-tem, facul-tas*. They could no doubt have spoken the words as we do, — we say *important, preventing, insulted*, — and if they did, then position would disappear. The only indication that they ever really did so is found in the instances above, where *scr* at the beginning of a word does not make position.

I have thus tried to account for the different shortenings of position-affected syllables in early Latin. The points I wish to make are these :

1. It is not to be expected in a matter of phonetics that all details should be reducible to one principle. Each combination had its own accommodations, as in our own clipped and adjusted sequences of sounds.

2. That position is syllabic in its nature, depending on the pause between consonants which is connected with a new letting go of the breath.

3. In cases where we have monumental evidence, we may assume whole or partial loss of one of the consonantal elements.<sup>1</sup>

4. In cases of repeated consonants, including assimilated ones, the Italian pause (cf. 2 above) was neglected so that position failed to be effected.

5. In all cases of consonants capable of beginning a syllable (including even Greek combinations) we may assume a syllabification which essentially combined instead of separating the consonants, thus destroying position precisely as in the mute and liquid combination and in the two consonants at the beginning of a word. This principle might often be combined with loss.

6. The case of liquid + consonant I leave undecided, but with the ground cleared for the adoption of either one of the suggested theories ; though my own opinion is in favor of a continuous utterance, as in English. But, in fact, between that and vocalization there is very little difference.

Either of these theories might readily be combined with the loss, which often took place in these cases.

I have only considered the How? The question Why? I will leave to others—a question which is not likely to lack discussion. It seems necessary to refer to some objections that are found in books to such views as I have presented.

C. F. W. Müller (*Plautinische Prosodie*) seems to say in many places that the phonetic discussion of the facts is not only useless,

---

<sup>1</sup> This may be combined with shortening of natural length.

but obstructive for the determination of early Latin prosody. This was perhaps true until the *metrical* limitations of the shortening were generally determined; but it seems to me that as soon as that is done the next step is and ought to be to inquire how the shortening is effected. The three questions are *When?* *How?* and *Why?*—and though the *When?* must come first, the others are indispensable for any system that can properly be called science. It cannot be too firmly kept in mind that poetry, especially a form of poetry that appealed to a large and, in general, slightly cultivated audience, must rest on habitual speech. Poetry, in order to be poetry, must be rhythmical to the ear of the hearer, or it is not poetry. However rude we may suppose the ear of the Roman to have been in metrical matters, yet he must, like the rest of the human race, have learned rhythm from the movements of the human body which, ultimately, depend on the heart and the lungs. When rhythm is transferred to speech, it must conform to a quality of speech either natural or acquired. Nobody doubts that Roman speech had from the earliest times long and short syllables in some form or other; and it seems to me perfectly clear that when Greek metres were introduced they must have conformed, or been made to conform, essentially to the natural or at least possible rhythms of speech. One might call my attention to rude broadsides circulated among the ignorant, or songs sung at popular theatres; but even these are felt to conform in the delivery, and even if they were not, they are different from ancient poetry in that they are written by people as ignorant as the hearers themselves. But the writers of the ancient poetry were Greeks essentially, to whom the Greek was quite as familiar as the Latin, and if they forced the Latin into Greek measures, they did it with full knowledge of the rhythm of the Greek. They were perhaps making a compromise between the two languages; but they must have had the Greek constantly in their ears, and where they deviate from it, they must have done so under the influence of Latin speech, not Latin written words. The accommodation must have been made somehow, the only question is *How?*



## THE *κότταβος κατακτός* IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT INVESTIGATIONS.

BY HERMAN W. HAYLEY.

THE nature of the so-called *κότταβος κατακτός* has been discussed pretty fully in two recent German dissertations<sup>1</sup>; but as the authors of these have come to opposite conclusions in regard to several points, it may be worth while to reconsider the evidence on both sides.

That the word *κατακτός* (from *κατάγειν*) in itself means "capable of being brought down" or "lowered" is undisputed, and may be assumed as certain. But why was the term applied to a variety of the *κότταβος*, and what was the nature of the variety thus designated?

It is evident from a comparison of Athenaeus 667 e, the schol. to Aristoph. Pax 1244 and the schol. to Lucian Lexiph. 3 (Vol. IV. p. 149 Jacobitz) that the author who is their common source distinguished two varieties of the cottabus, the *κότταβος κατακτός* and the *παιδιά ἐν λεκάνῃ* (or *κότταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων*). The *κότταβος κατακτός* he described as a tall, candelabrum-like instrument, equipped with a head (*πρόσωπον*) or figure called *μάνης*. If the throw was properly made, an object called the *πλάστιγξ* in its descent fell upon the *μάνης*. It is clear, therefore, that this writer (Dicaearchus? so Boehm, p. 14) included under the name of *κότταβος κατακτός* all instruments of the rod and plastinx type, or at least such of them as possessed the *μάνης*.<sup>2</sup> This being the case, it becomes highly probable that he understood the term *κατακτός* as referring to the *bringing down* (*κατάγειν*) of the *πλάστιγξ* from the top of the cottabus-rod—a

---

<sup>1</sup> "Das Kottabos-Spiel der alten Griechen," by Dr. Karl Sartori, Munich, 1893; "De Cottabo," by Chr. Boehm, Bonn, 1893.

<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately no ancient writer tells us whether the *μάνης* was *always* present in *κοτταβεῖα* of the rod and plastinx variety.

simple and natural explanation which has been recently revived by Sartori. If this explanation be correct, there can be little doubt that the ancients included under the name *κότταβος κατακτός* all instruments of the rod and plastinx type, as opposed to the *κότταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων*. Thus the two great varieties of the cottabus as seen in the vase-paintings receive their appropriate names.

There was, however, even in antiquity another explanation of the term *κατακτός*, which has found many adherents among modern scholars. In Athenaeus 666 e we read: *ἐκάλουν δὲ καὶ κατακτοῦς τινὰς κοττάβους. ἔστι δὲ λυχνία ἀναγόμενα πάλιν τε συμπίπτοντα.*<sup>1</sup> *Εὐβουλος Βελλεροφόντῃ* (II, 171 Kock).

*τίς ἂν λάβοιτο τοῦ σκέλους κάτωθε μοι;  
ἄνω γὰρ ὥσπερ κοττάβειον αἶρομαι.*

These words clearly refer to some contrivance for raising and lowering the cottabus-rod, and have been so understood by most authorities. Sartori, to be sure, suggests that in using the words *ἀνάγεσθαι* and *συμπίπτειν* "Athenaeus wohl das Auflegen und Herabschleudern der Plastinx im Auge hat" (p. 90). But if this is so, it is difficult to see why Athenaeus chose a mode of expression so extremely liable to be misunderstood. We may conclude, therefore, that he, or the writer whom he followed in this passage, explained the term *κατακτός* as referring to a sliding rod, which could be lowered at will. The only question is whether he was right in so doing.

There are several reasons for believing that *κοτταβεία* with a movable rod were sometimes used by the ancients. The fragment already quoted from the Bellerophon of Eubulus is most easily understood on this hypothesis. Moreover, as Jahn long ago pointed out,<sup>2</sup> candelabra with an apparatus for regulating their height have been preserved. These have a solid shaft fitting into a hollow standard, both being pierced with small holes; so that by inserting a small peg through one of the holes in the standard and into a hole

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the schol. to Aristoph. Pax 1242: *κατακτοὶ δὲ ἐκλήθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κατάγειν καὶ αὐτὸ πάλιν ἀνάγειν τὸν κότταβον.*

<sup>2</sup> See "Philologus," vol. XXVI (1867), p. 206 ff.

in the shaft the instrument may be held at the required height.<sup>1</sup> Κοτταβεία in which the rod consists of two parts, the upper one being of less diameter than the lower and apparently fitting into it, occur repeatedly in the vase-paintings (see Boehm, p. 23); and it is probable that these had an arrangement similar to that of the candelabra just mentioned. Sartori (p. 88) lays great stress upon the fact that the vase-paintings show no trace of any peg inserted through an opening in the standard to hold the rod in place. But such a peg would be very small, and the artists who made the paintings would be extremely apt to omit it altogether. Sartori himself argues (p. 38) that the μάνης is not represented on the vases because of its small size; yet the μάνης was surely far larger than such a peg would be. Moreover, it is not safe to assert that the peg is *never* shown in the paintings until all the vases on which the κότταβος κατακτός is figured have been carefully examined in regard to this point. Sartori also urges the fact that no contrivance for raising and lowering the rod is found in the extant κοτταβεία. But it is extremely doubtful whether the so-called cottabus-instruments that have been discovered are not really candelabra (cf. Boehm, p. 27 ff.; Wochenschrift f. klass. Philologie, Sept. 20, 1893). Moreover none of them were found in Greece proper, and they are not numerous enough to justify the conclusion that instruments with a sliding rod were not in use. It is almost incredible that people so keen-witted as the Greeks should not have seen the advantages of the movable rod and have made the necessary improvement.

The probabilities, then, favor the hypothesis that cottabus-instruments with a sliding rod were sometimes used by the ancients; but were these called κότταβοι κατακτοί?

There is a well-known passage in the Pax of Aristophanes (1240 ff.) which Higgins<sup>2</sup> and others have used as evidence that the κότταβος κατακτός had a movable rod. It runs thus:

ΟΠΙΩΝ ΚΑΠΗΛΟΣ

τί δ' ἄρα τῇ σάλπιγγι τῇδε χρῆσσομαι  
ἣν ἐπριάμην δραχμῶν ποθ' ἐξήκοντ' ἐγώ;

<sup>1</sup> See Quaranta, "Di un candelabro di bronzo," Naples, 1852, for a description of such a candelabrum. <sup>2</sup> See his article in "Archaeologia," vol. 51, pp. 363 ff.



## ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ

μόλυβδον ἐς τουτὶ τὸ κοῖλον ἐγχέας  
 ἔπειτ' ἄνωθεν ῥάβδον ἐνθεῖς ὑπόμακρον,  
 γενήσεται σοι τῶν κατακτῶν κοττάβων.

The general sense is clear enough. Trygaeus advises the weapon-seller to convert the trumpet into the standard of a *κότταβος κατακτός*. This is to be accomplished by filling the bell-shaped *κώδων* of the *σάλπιγξ* with lead, so that it will stand firmly, and inserting into the mouth-piece a "longish rod." But there is not one word to indicate that the rod could be *raised* or *lowered* in the standard, unless we assume that the name *κότταβος κατακτός* implies this. We are not even justified in inferring that the cottabus-rod regularly consisted of two parts (cf. Boehm, p. 11). It is quite sufficient to suppose that the rod was added because the trumpet alone was not long enough for a *ῥάβδος κοτταβική*, though well adapted by its shape to form the base of the instrument (so Sartori, p. 25).

On the other hand, there are several reasons for believing that the name *κότταβος κατακτός* was not confined to *κοτταβεῖα* with a sliding rod. We find, both on the vases and in the literature, two great varieties of the cottabus, the rod and *plastinx* type and the *κότταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων*. This fact, as has been shown already, was recognized by the author whom Athenaeus, the scholiast to Aristophanes and the scholiast to Lucian followed in their descriptions of the cottabus. That author applied the term *κατακτός* to the rod and *plastinx* instrument, but, so far as we can judge, did not mention the *sliding* rod as essential. It is not at all probable that *all* instruments of the rod and *plastinx* type had a contrivance for varying their height; and if we confine the name *κότταβος κατακτός* to those possessing such a contrivance, we have no name whatever for those destitute of it. The sliding rod is but an unessential detail, and not a characteristic feature of the whole class. But if we accept the other explanation and include under the name of *κότταβος κατακτός* all *κοτταβεῖα* with rod and *plastinx*, we have an appropriate name for all instruments of this variety, as opposed to the *κότταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων*. Hence while Sartori is probably wrong in denying the existence of instru-

ments with a sliding rod, he is right in his main contention that the term *κατακτός* was applied to the rod and *plastinx* *κοτταβεῖα* as a class.

The nature of the rod and *plastinx* *cottabus*, or *κότταβος κατακτός*, as we shall call it henceforth, is tolerably clear from the description given by Athenaeus and from the vase-paintings; but there arises one very difficult question, about which scholars have entertained the most diverse opinions. What was the *μάνης*, which ancient writers<sup>1</sup> mention as a part of the *κότταβος κατακτός*?

Helbig, Robert, Sartori and most recent authorities identify it with the statuettes that surmount several of the so-called *ράβδοι κοτταβικαί* which have been found in Etruria. As *Μάνης* is a common slave-name, the fact that these statuettes represent slaves lends weight to the identification; but there are several arguments against it which seem quite conclusive. These arguments have been somewhat inadequately stated by Boehm, although they make for his own theory. They are as follows:

1. No such statuette is seen on the top of a *cottabus*-rod in any vase-painting. Robert and Sartori both admit this.

2. In a well-known fragment (II. 33 Kock) of the *Ἀφροδίτης Γοναί* of Antiphanes (who flourished about 380 B.C., while the *κότταβος* was still in use), one of the speakers says of the *πλάστιγξ*, which is resting on (*ἐπικείμενον*) the end of the *ράβδος κοτταβική*:

*ἐὰν θίγῃς μόνον  
αὐτῆς, ἐπὶ τὸν μάνην πεσεῖται καὶ ψόφος  
ἔσται πάνυ πολὺς.*

Nothing can be more explicit. The slightest touch will dislodge the *πλάστιγξ*, which will then fall upon the *μάνης* and produce a loud noise. But how can the *πλάστιγξ* fall from the top of the rod upon the *μάνης*, if the *μάνης* itself forms the top of the rod? Again, the author from whom Athenaeus, the scholiast to Aristophanes and the scholiast to Lucian took their descriptions of the *κότταβος κατακτός* (II. s. c.) certainly had the words *ἔχον ἐν αὐτῷ πρόσωπον, ὃ μάνην ἐκάλουν*,

<sup>1</sup> See especially Athenaeus 667 e (cf. schol. on Aristoph. Pax 1244 and schol. on Lucian Lexiph. 3); a fragment of Antiphanes, II. 33 Kock; and the fragment of Hermippus, I. 237 Kock.

## ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ

μόλυβδον ἐς τουτὶ τὸ κοῖλον ἐγχέας  
 ἔπειτ' ἄνωθεν ῥάβδον ἐνθεῖς ὑπόμακρον,  
 γενήσεται σοι τῶν κατακτῶν κοττάβων.

The general sense is clear enough. Trygaeus advises the weapon-seller to convert the trumpet into the standard of a *κότταβος κατακτός*. This is to be accomplished by filling the bell-shaped *κώδων* of the *σάλπιγξ* with lead, so that it will stand firmly, and inserting into the mouth-piece a "longish rod." But there is not one word to indicate that the rod could be *raised* or *lowered* in the standard, unless we assume that the name *κότταβος κατακτός* implies this. We are not even justified in inferring that the cottabus-rod regularly consisted of two parts (cf. Boehm, p. 11). It is quite sufficient to suppose that the rod was added because the trumpet alone was not long enough for a *ῥάβδος κοτταβική*, though well adapted by its shape to form the base of the instrument (so Sartori, p. 25).

On the other hand, there are several reasons for believing that the name *κότταβος κατακτός* was not confined to *κοτταβεῖα* with a sliding rod. We find, both on the vases and in the literature, two great varieties of the cottabus, the rod and *plastinx* type and the *κότταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων*. This fact, as has been shown already, was recognized by the author whom Athenaeus, the scholiast to Aristophanes and the scholiast to Lucian followed in their descriptions of the cottabus. That author applied the term *κατακτός* to the rod and *plastinx* instrument, but, so far as we can judge, did not mention the *sliding* rod as essential. It is not at all probable that *all* instruments of the rod and *plastinx* type had a contrivance for varying their height; and if we confine the name *κότταβος κατακτός* to those possessing such a contrivance, we have no name whatever for those destitute of it. The sliding rod is but an unessential detail, and not a characteristic feature of the whole class. But if we accept the other explanation and include under the name of *κότταβος κατακτός* all *κοτταβεῖα* with rod and *plastinx*, we have an appropriate name for all instruments of this variety, as opposed to the *κότταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων*. Hence while Sartori is probably wrong in denying the existence of instru-

ments with a sliding rod, he is right in his main contention that the term *κατακτός* was applied to the rod and *plastinx* *κοτταβεία* as a class.

The nature of the rod and *plastinx* *cottabus*, or *κότταβος κατακτός*, as we shall call it henceforth, is tolerably clear from the description given by Athenaeus and from the vase-paintings; but there arises one very difficult question, about which scholars have entertained the most diverse opinions. What was the *μάνης*, which ancient writers<sup>1</sup> mention as a part of the *κότταβος κατακτός*?

Helbig, Robert, Sartori and most recent authorities identify it with the statuettes that surmount several of the so-called *ράβδοι κοτταβικαί* which have been found in Etruria. As *Μάνης* is a common slave-name, the fact that these statuettes represent slaves lends weight to the identification; but there are several arguments against it which seem quite conclusive. These arguments have been somewhat inadequately stated by Boehm, although they make for his own theory. They are as follows:

1. No such statuette is seen on the top of a *cottabus*-rod in any vase-painting. Robert and Sartori both admit this.
2. In a well-known fragment (II. 33 Kock) of the *Ἀφροδίτης Γοναί* of Antiphanes (who flourished about 380 B.C., while the *κότταβος* was still in use), one of the speakers says of the *πλάστιγξ*, which is resting on (*ἐπικείμενον*) the end of the *ράβδος κοτταβική*:

ἐὰν θίγῃς μόνον  
αὐτῆς, ἐπὶ τὸν μάνην πεσεῖται καὶ ψόφος  
ἔσται πάνυ πολὺς.

Nothing can be more explicit. The slightest touch will dislodge the *πλάστιγξ*, which will then fall upon the *μάνης* and produce a loud noise. But how can the *πλάστιγξ* fall from the top of the rod upon the *μάνης*, if the *μάνης* itself forms the top of the rod? Again, the author from whom Athenaeus, the scholiast to Aristophanes and the scholiast to Lucian took their descriptions of the *κότταβος κατακτός* (II. s. c.) certainly had the words *ἔχον ἐν αὐτῷ πρόσωπον, ὃ μάνην ἐκάλουν*,

<sup>1</sup> See especially Athenaeus 667 e (cf. schol. on Aristoph. Pax 1244 and schol. on Lucian Lexiph. 3); a fragment of Antiphanes, II. 33 Kock; and the fragment of Hermippus, I. 237 Kock.

ἰφ' οὗ ἴδει πεσεῖν καταβαλλομένην τὴν πλάστιγγα (so the schol. to Aristophanes), or something of the same purport; for these words occur with very slight variations<sup>1</sup> in all three versions. It is clear, therefore, that the *μάνης* was at a considerable distance below the top of the rod, so that if the throw was skilfully made, the *πλάστιγγ*, in falling, would strike with sufficient force to produce a loud sound.

3. The alleged *ῥάβδοι κοτταβικαί* that have been discovered so closely resemble candelabra that the identification is rendered very uncertain (see Boehm, l. s. c.).

We may conclude, therefore, that the *μάνης* was not upon the top of the cottabus-rod.<sup>2</sup> There remain three alternatives. Either the *μάνης* was *between* the top of the rod and the basin (*λεκάνη*), or it was *within* the basin, or the basin itself was called *μάνης*.

The first of these alternatives might derive some support from the description of the *κότταβος κατακτός* in Athenaeus 667 e; but it is possible that the clause *ἐντεῦθεν δὲ πίπτειν εἰς λεκάνην ὑποκειμένην πληγείσαν τῷ κοττάβῳ* is an interpolation. It is not found in the schol. to Lucian Lexiph. 3 (Vol. IV. p. 149, Jacobitz) nor in the second schol. to Aristoph. Pax 1244, which were drawn from the same source as the account in Athenaeus; and the words *πληγείσαν τῷ κοττάβῳ* occasion difficulty.<sup>3</sup> Even if the clause is genuine, it is susceptible of a different interpretation, as will be shown later. Moreover, the vase-paintings show no object between the top of the cottabus-rod and the basin to which the name of *μάνης* could reasonably be given.

The theory that the basin or disk which encircled the shaft of the cottabus was called *μάνης* has recently been advocated with great

<sup>1</sup> Athenaeus has not the words *ἐν αὐτῷ πρόσωπον*, but says simply *ἔχον τὸν μάνην καλούμενον*.

<sup>2</sup> It may be suggested that the *πλάστιγγ* was hung or poised in some way *above* the end of the *ῥάβδοι κοτταβικῆ*, so as to strike it or fall upon it if touched (cf. Pollux Onom. VI. 109). But the vase-paintings show the *πλάστιγγ* resting *directly upon* the top of the rod, not poised or suspended *above* it. Hence such a solution of the difficulty is excluded.

<sup>3</sup> Dobree proposed that they should be placed immediately after *πλάστιγγα* in the preceding clause, and Meineke so reads.

force and ingenuity by Boehm. Among his arguments the following deserve special notice :

1. The *κότταβος κατακτός*, as represented in the vase-paintings, regularly consists of three parts, the *πλάστιγξ*, the *ράβδος κοτταβική* and the basin. Antiphanes (l. s. c.) and Hermippus (I. 237 Kock) likewise mention only three parts, the *πλάστιγξ*, the *ράβδος* and the *μάνης*. It is probable, therefore, that the basin and the *μάνης* were identical.

2. Athenaeus (487 e) informs us that the name *μάνης* was given to a kind of drinking-vessel;<sup>1</sup> and Photius (s. v. *μάνης*) expressly states that the vessel used in the game of cottabus was called *μάνης*.

It must be admitted, also, that Boehm's theory accords very well with the evidence of the vase-paintings and with the description given by Antiphanes, who wrote before the cottabus went out of use. If Boehm is right, we may dismiss at one stroke all the absurd and confused statements of Pollux, the scholiasts to Aristophanes and Lucian, Tzetzes, etc. He cuts at one stroke the Gordian knot of the *μάνης*-problem.

But it must be confessed that Boehm's theory is open to some very serious objections.

1. In a fragment of the Salmoneus of Sophocles (494 Nauck) occur these lines :

τῷ καλλικοτταβούντι νικητήρια  
τίθημι καὶ βαλόντι χάλκειον κᾶρα.

Athenaeus expressly states (487 d) that the words *χάλκειον κᾶρα* refer to the *μάνης*. They certainly could not well be applied to the *λεκάνη*.<sup>2</sup>

2. Again, the writer from whom the schol. to Pax 1244 and the schol. to Lucian *Lexiph.* 3 took their descriptions, spoke of the *μάνης* as a *πρόσωπον* ; for that term is applied to it in both versions. The

<sup>1</sup> Athenaeus continues : *καλεῖται δὲ μάνης καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ κοττάβου ἐφεστηκός, ἐφ' οὗ τὰς λάταγας ἐν παιδιᾷ ἔτεμπον*, on which Boehm (p. 27) observes : "quae verba quoniam in vasorum indice exstant, de vase vel de aliqua re vasi simili intelligenda sunt." But the remark may be a mere digression on the part of Athenaeus.

<sup>2</sup> Boehm (p. 15) thinks that *χάλκειον κᾶρα* means the *πλάστιγξ*, the "head" or "crown" of the instrument ; but this interpretation seems forced.

πρόσωπον of these scholiasts is clearly the same thing as the *χάλκειον κάρα* of Sophocles, and seems to have been some kind of figure or statuette. A basin it certainly was not. We might also add that the schol. to Aristoph. 343 says that the *μάνης* was a statuette (*ἀνδριάς*); but his whole account of the cottabus with beam and scale-pans is so absurd as to have little or no weight. But the fact that *Μάνης* was a common slave-name certainly favors the view that the *μάνης* was a statuette.

3. The words of Athenaeus 667 e. ἔχον τὸν μάνην καλούμενον, ἐφ' ὃν τὴν καταβαλλομένην ἴδει πεσεῖν πλάστιγγα, ἐντεῦθεν δὲ πίπτειν εἰς λεκάνην ὑποκειμένην πληγέειαν τῷ κοττάβῳ are absolutely fatal to Boehm's hypothesis, if the last clause is genuine.

It is clear, therefore, that the theory of Boehm, although it is very attractive, should not be hastily accepted. There remains one alternative, that the *μάνης* was *within* the basin. It is strange that this solution of the difficulty, which certainly has much in its favor, has been entirely neglected by previous writers on the cottabus. If we suppose that the *μάνης* was a statuette of a slave standing in the *λεκάνη*, perhaps at a height of two or three inches above the bottom, the instrument will then accord very well with the description given by Antiphanes, and with those of Athenaeus and the two scholiasts so often referred to above. The requirements of the case are more fully met by this hypothesis than by any of the others that have been proposed. The fact that the statuette never appears in the vase-paintings is accounted for on the supposition that it was concealed within the basin, just as in representations of the *κότταβος* δι' *δξύβάφων* the *δξύβαφα* are not shown. As the *πλάστιγξ* would strike the *μάνης* before it did the basin, the remark of Athenaeus about the *λεκάνη ὑποκειμένη* would be amply justified. The old expression of the scholiasts, ἔχον ἐν αὐτῷ πρόσωπον, would also be accounted for, and the fragment from the Salmoneus would fall into line.

One serious objection may be urged against this theory. The *κοτταβεία* represented on the vases often have the basin *inverted* (cf. Boehm, p. 23; Sartori, p. 115). No doubt this is due in some cases to carelessness on the part of the artist; but there are some vase-paintings in which the basin was evidently *intentionally* represented with its concave side downwards. But we have no proof that the

statuette was *always* present. The game would be much less difficult without it, and it is improbable that it was always used. If now we suppose that when the statuette was not present, the name *μάνης* was transferred to the basin itself, the statement of Photius s. v. *μάνης* is easily explained.

A friend has suggested to the writer that if we suppose the *μάνης* to have been a statuette within the basin, the development of the *κότταβος κατακτός* may perhaps be traced somewhat as follows :

I. First step : the wine is thrown at the head of a living slave. Cf. Eurip. Oen. fr. 562 Nauck ; Aesch. Ostol. fr. 179 Nauck.

II. Second stage : A bronze figure called *Μάνης* is substituted for the slave.

III. Third stage : The figure is placed in a basin to prevent the floor from becoming sloppy with wine. Cf. Nonnus Dionys. XXXIII. 65 ff., where the players throw the wine at the head of a statuette of Hebe standing in a basin.

IV. Fourth stage : The wine is not thrown directly at the figure, but at a disk poised on a rod above it, so as to fall upon it. The *μάνης* remains in the basin, through the centre of which the rod passes. This is the fully developed *κότταβος κατακτός*.

Such are some of the theories that have been advanced in regard to this most perplexed and difficult problem. The present writer, while by no means certain that a final solution has yet been reached, is, on the whole, inclined to accept the theory last mentioned, as it seems to agree best with the evidence of the literature and to be liable to fewer grave objections than the rest. The question can only be settled by a new and careful examination of all the representations of the *κότταβος κατακτός* to be found in European museums. It is to be hoped that such an examination will soon be made by some competent scholar.

In conclusion, the writer may mention some simple experiments, with very rude apparatus, which he undertook in order to test the possibility of such a cottabus-game as he is inclined to suppose. They have satisfied him that, under the conditions assumed, to hit a statuette with the *πλάστιγξ* would be quite possible, and indeed not very difficult. A round box-cover of tin was used for a *plastinx*, and a little copper door-handle, resembling a head in shape, for a *μάνης*.



An ordinary tin basin of large size served for the λεκάνη. The rod was made of wood, and water was used instead of wine. At a distance of eight to twelve feet, the writer, by careful throwing, could hit the μάνης about once in five times. It projected two and a half inches above the bottom of the basin.

## DE SCHOLIIS ARISTOPHANEIS QUAESTIONES MYTHICAE.

SCRIPTIT CAROLUS BURTON GULICK.

SCHOLIA perlegenti in Aristophanis comoedias scripta tribus fere annis abhinc mihi in mentem venit eis operam dare examinandis quibus historiae fabulaeque deorum referuntur ut, si quid mihi forte eveniret prospere, fontes et auctores scholiastae accuratius demonstrarem ac definirem.<sup>1</sup> cum autem in universum quibus ex viris doctis antiquis scholia emanarint satis constat<sup>2</sup>—nam quis Phainum, Symmachum, Didymum, Euphronium, Callistratum, denique Aristarchum nostri poetae interpretes fuisse nescit?—mihi quidem id tantum restabat ut locos scholiastae nonnullos recognoscerem subtilius, ut qua ratione Didymus aut Symmachus studia sua in scriptores rerum fabularum superiores exercuerit magis eluceret. nam Apollodorus, ut opinor, qui vel maxime fabulas mythicas indagavit et tractavit, quanti momenti fuerit non satis adhuc expositum est. hunc igitur laborem suscepi, huius aliorumque hominum rebus similibus deditorum auctoritatem apud nostrum explicare, tractare, statuere. neque enim tam sperare audeam ad has res cognoscendas nova me adlaturum esse praesidia atque adiu-

---

<sup>1</sup> de scholiis historicis iam disseruit copiose Guilelmus Meiners in *Diss. Halens.*, vol. xi (1890), pp. 219 seqq.; de rebus divinis feriisque partim modo Paulus Stengel, Berol. 1880: *Ad res sacras cognoscendas cuiusnam sint momenti scholia Aristophanea*.

<sup>2</sup> cf. O. Schneider, *de veterum in Aristophanem scholiorum fontibus*, Sundiae, 1838, quem librum me non potuisse inspicere valde lugeo; vir tamen clarus, Didymi auctoritate paene neglecta, nimium videtur Symmachi sollertiae ac scientiae tribuisse; cf. A. Schauenburg, *de Symmachi in Aristophanis interpretatione subsidiis*, 1881. ac de scholiis Aristophaneis bene meriti sunt R. Schnee: *Ein Beitrag zur Kritik der Aristophanes-Scholien*, 1879; et praecipue G. Stein, *Scholia in Lysistratam*, cuius in libro magistri facile conspici potest manus praestantissimi Wilamowitzii; M. Schmidt, *Didymi Chalcenteri Fragmenta*, pp. 289 seqq.

menta quam recta et vera propositurum. quod si mihi quidem hoc contigerit, illos Alexandrinos eruditos, quibus hodie in Germania maximo studio atque eventu optimo opera navatur — utinam hic quoque in patria nostra tam penitus cogniti essent!<sup>1</sup> — in lucem ac scientiam paullulum protulisse, gratias omnibus meis praeceptoribus qui me harum rerum cupiditate cognoscendarum incitaverint iustissimas referam semperque habebo.

sed quicumque haec scholia minutius et scrupulosius examinare velit statim in opera incipienda offendat difficultates graves, quia editio eorum a Dindorfio et Duebnero anno 1843 publicata parum ad usum criticorum hodiernum sufficit, adeo ut multas ob causas quae tum grammaticos tum historicos attingant verba etiam nunc scholiastae persaepe medicina egeant. ac Suidae auctoritatem, quae quantum ad hanc rem valeat iam diu vidit Bernhardy, ostenderunt autem dilucide Buenger et Zacher,<sup>2</sup> in illa editione ferme neglexerunt viri docti. eis autem qui codicis instar tertii — nam Ravennas Venetusque et aetate et auctoritate ceteris longe antecedunt — Suida uti voluerunt ego equidem adstipulor.

quod igitur mihi est propositum iam satis apparet. dum enim e scholiis eligam ea imprimis quae ad fabulas deorum heroumque pertineant, de aliis quoque haud raro dicam quae huic rei germana esse videantur, cum diffusius quam brevius maluerim disputare; nam et quanti sint ea ad historias fabulares cognoscendas aliis aliunde collatis subsidiis decernere conabor, et auctoritatem Apollodori, vel si quis alius talium rerum scriptor eadem tractaverit, quantum apud nostrum valuerit diiudicare proposui.

quibus iam expositis nunc ad ipsam rem et disputationem ingredior.

#### I. — DE DIIS ANTIQUISSIMIS.

De eis qui in deorum numero ante Iovis regnum a genealogis feruntur numinibus nec multa nec gravia tradit scholiasta, quamquam Chaos, Noctem, Amorem, Iapetum (*Nub.* 998), Rheam vel

<sup>1</sup> vid. Jebb, *Classical Greek Poetry*, p. 229 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Bernhardy, *Suid.*, praef., p. xlviii. O. Buenger, *de Aristophanis ap. Suid. vell.*, Diss. Argent., i. 149. K. Zacher, *Aristophanes-Scholien*, pp. 564–565.

Opem, quorum nomina apud poetam ipsum invenit, memorat. sunt loci hi: *Av.* 697, ἡ δὲ ὅλη σύστασις, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πτερωτοῦ Ἔρωτος τὰ ὄρνεά ἐστιν. ἀτόπως μὴν καὶ ἀπιθάνως τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ κέχρηται. verba haec, licet locutio ἀτόπως καὶ ἀπιθάνως, sicut illud οὐκ ὀρθῶς, Didymum grammaticum sapiat, tamen ad eum vix referenda esse censeo, id quod ex schol. 704 apparet. atque ad v. 695 scholiasta, qui de ovo tantum quo Castor et Pollux nati sunt<sup>1</sup> cogitat, de illo quo secundum Orphicos<sup>2</sup> ortus sit mundus nihil suspicatur. cave autem eundem putes scholiastam plane ignorasse genealogos veteres: *Av.* 693, Χάος ἦν καὶ Νύξ· ταῦτα οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἀπευθύνειν πρὸς τὰ Ἡσιόδου<sup>3</sup> ἢ πρὸς τινὰ ἄλλου τινὸς γενεαλόγον, — quibus ex verbis constat illum tantum abesse ut origines deorum neglexerit, ut ne discrepantias quidem ex inventione poetae fictas corrigere temptaverit neque corrigendas censuerit, utpote talium varietatum apud poetas crebrarum peritus.

*Nub.* 424, Rav.: Χάος λέγει τὸν ἀέρα, παρὰ τὸ κεχύσθαι. Stoicum est hoc,<sup>4</sup> quod ego ex antiquissimis fontibus ductum esse sentio. chaos enim, inquit, aer est, vel τὸ κενόν, ut Stoici dicebant. Hesychius autem, cui dum Diogenianum Pamphilumque sequitur, Didymus fonti est ultimo,<sup>5</sup> s. voce χάος postquam Hesiodi *Theog.* 116 explicavit dicit continuo: καὶ τὸ κενόν, αἶτ, ἀπὸ τοῦ κεχύσθαι.

vide iam sis scholium partim mutilum, neque in Ravennati neque in Veneto repertum, ad *Nub.* 247: γεγονέναι πρῶτον μὲν τοὺς κατὰ Ὀφίωνα καὶ Εὐρυνόμην· δεύτερον δὲ τοὺς κατὰ Κρόνον καὶ Ῥέαν, οὐστίνας Ὀμηρος [*Il.* 5. 898] Οὐρανιώνας· τρίτον δὲ τοὺς Διὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν καταλύσαντας<sup>6</sup> τὴν ἐκείνων, οὓς Ὀλυμπίους κληζόμεν. Eurynomen vero Oceani Tethyosque filiam memorat Ps.-Apollodorus 1. 2. 2;<sup>7</sup> atque Oceanitidem Eurynomen Ophionemque antiquissimos deorum parentes secundum Orphicos vetustiores notum est fuisse.<sup>8</sup> quod

<sup>1</sup> cf. infra, p. 150.

<sup>2</sup> Roscher, *Lexicon*, p. 1345.

<sup>3</sup> Hes. *Theog.* 116, Acusilaus, *FHG*, i. 100, Müll.

<sup>4</sup> Philo, περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου, 5.

<sup>5</sup> Stemma est hoc: Didymus — Theonis *lex. comicum* — Iulius Vestinus — Diogenianus — Hesychius. vid. Naber, *Phot. Lex.*, p. 18; cf. p. 9.

<sup>6</sup> haec fere sunt verba eadem de re Aristocriti ap. Schol. *Vesp.* 846.

<sup>7</sup> cf. 3. 12. 6; Schol. Ap. Rh., i. 498.

<sup>8</sup> Orph. *Fragm.*, 35. 503, Abel; Mayer, *Giganten und Titanen*, p. 234.

autem formam 'Οφίωνα, non 'Οφιονέα, quae versu hexametro parum accommodari possit, servat noster, et illum arbitreris sicut Schol. Ap. Rh. et Ps.-Apollod. ex Orphicis haec delibasse; sed scholium hoc melioribus codicibus ignotum potius Tzetzaetribuendum est, qui eadem ratione verbisque similibus hanc rem tractaverat ad Lycophronis v. 1191.

homines seniles stultosque vocari Κρόνους id est quasi Saturnos testatur schol. *Nub.* 998, 397, 929, 1070, *Vesp.* 1480, *Plut.* 581, quibus ex locis scholiastam comoediam antiquam penitus cognovisse manifestum est.<sup>1</sup> omnia igitur ad haec pertinentia Didymi sunt, qui etiam bene vivere Saturno rege homines sciebat: *Nub.* 821, ἀρχαῖοι οἱ μωροὶ ἐκαλοῦντο ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ Κρόνου ἐκείνων ἀρχαίων καὶ ἀπραγμόνων ἀνδρῶν. quam opinionem de pristina humani generis felicitate Saturni temporibus iam apud Cratinum reperies.<sup>2</sup>

ad Didymum quoque referenda sunt pauca quae feruntur de Cybele vel Magna Matre, quam deorum matrem esse secundum poetas dicit noster.<sup>3</sup> cf. enim schol. *Av.* 877 cum schol. *Soph. Philoct.* 391 et 401:

Schol. *Av.*  
Κυβέλην φασὶ τὴν 'Ρέαν, παρὰ  
τὰ Κύβελα ὄρη.<sup>4</sup> ὀρεία γὰρ ἡ  
θεός, διὸ καὶ ἐποχεῖται λεόντων  
ζεύγει.

Schol. *Phil.*  
ὀρεστέρα· ὀρεία· ἡ αὐτὴ δὲ ἐστὶ  
τῇ γῇ. ἐν δὲ τοῖς ὄρεσι τὰ μυστη-  
ρια αὐτῆς γίνεται . . . . .  
. . . ἐπὶ ἄρματος γὰρ λεόντων  
ὀχεῖται ἡ 'Ρέα.

noster vero his verbis insequitur: ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος, inquit, μητέρα Κλεοκρίτου, ὅτι ὡς γυναικίας καὶ κίμαιδος κωμωδεῖται. ἐν δὲ τοῖς μυστηρίοις τῆς 'Ρέας μαλακοὶ πάρεσι. haec vero quasi e thesauris deprompsit Didymus non ex ullo libro de fabulis scripto, sed de Aristarchi vel Apollonii commentariis, qui de eodem Cleocrito disputaverunt ad *Ran.* 1437. id quoque hanc corroborat sententiam, Didymum vel quemlibet etiam ante eum haec scripsisse, quod Cybeles turritae aut

<sup>1</sup> cf. Athen., 3. 113 A, 9. 403 F; Alex. Frag., 62 K.

<sup>2</sup> Frag. 165 K (Athen., 6. 267 E); vid. etiam Hes. *Op.* 111, quem versum tamen elicerunt Goettling et Schoemann.

<sup>3</sup> *Ach.* 745; cf. *Plut.* 431, ubi eam cum Cerere confudisse videtur.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Strab. 12. 567, ἀπὸ τῶν Κυβέλων ἡ Κυβέλη.

turrigeræ mentionem non facit, cum poetae primi Romani hoc epitheton usurparint.<sup>1</sup> denique illud *πάρεισι*, quod Suidas s. *Κλεόκριτος* in *παρήσαν* perperam mutavit, antiquitatem atque aetatem indicat ipsi poetae supparem.

ac de Tellure, quam *Γαῖαν* vel *Γῆν* Graeci appellabant, pauca vero sed mentione nihilominus digna refert scholiasta. monstra et prodigia Terra nata sunt, ut videtur: *Av.* 1745 (*Rav. Ven. Suid.*), καὶ τὰς χθονίας κλήσατε· *Εὐφρόνιος*, τὰς φοβεράς. πάντα γὰρ τὰ δεινὰ τῆς γῆς γενεαλογούσιν.

ii autem qui haec tradunt poetae indicantur a schol. *Ap. Rh.* 1. 761, qui postquam sententias Homeri et Pherecydis laudavit addit haec: ἀλλ' ἐροῦμεν ὅτι οἱ ποιηταὶ τοὺς τερατώδεις κατὰ τὸ σῶμα γῆς εἶναι φασιν. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ Καλλίμαχος τὰ δεινὰ τῶν θηρίων γῆς εἶναι ἔφη. sed id quod Callimachus in suis narrationibus dicit, ex illis usurpavit qui theogonias id est origines deorum ante se fecerunt, qua re Euphronium quoque veri similis est Pherecydem hoc loco secutum esse.<sup>2</sup>

neque vero mirum est si Tellus *χθονία* appellabatur, neque desunt vestigia apud nostrum illius religionis dirae.<sup>3</sup> adfero enim scholium hoc, quo cassitam traditur avem fuisse Telluri sacram, *Av.* 471: τὸν δὲ κορυδὸν ἐνιοὶ κορυδαλὸν λέγουσι. Γῆς δὲ ἱερὸν ὄρνιν νομίζουσιν εἶναι. causam fortasse perspicies ap. schol. Theocr. 7. 23, quoniam hae aves maxime prope sepulcra nidos construebant.<sup>4</sup> Theocriti scholiastam comicum inspexisse plane manifestum est, cum is similem eius quam ex Aesopo ipse poeta (*Av.* 473) historiam tradit. nunc autem adpono aliud in Theocritum scholium et scholiastam Plat. *Euthyd.* 291 B, quibus facile perspiciatur haec cum nostro ambo cognata esse.

Schol. Theocr.

Schol. Platonis.

κόρυδοι ὄρντιν ὅμοιοι ὄρνιθες  
οὓς ἐνιοὶ κορυδαλούς καλοῦσι, καὶ  
'Αθηνᾶς ἱεροί.

κόρυδοι ὄρνιθες ὄρντιν ὅμοιοι  
οὓς ἐνιοὶ μὲν κορυδάλλους (sic)  
φασί, Γῆς καὶ 'Αθηνᾶς ἱεροί.

<sup>1</sup> Preller-Plew,<sup>3</sup> i. 530, adn. 4; Verg. *A.* 7. 785; Ov. *F.* 4. 219.

<sup>2</sup> Gigantum enim Terra mater erat Ps.-Apd. 2. 1. 2, ut omittam Typhoea (schol. *Eg.* 511, qui cum schol. Plat. *Phaedr.* 230 A convenit), Gorgonem (Eur. *Ion.* 989), Pythonem (schol. Aesch. *Eum.* 2).

<sup>3</sup> cf. Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 1259 seqq.

<sup>4</sup> λέγονται δὲ ἐπιτύμβιοι, ὅτι τάφοις ὡς ἐπιπολὶ ἐνδιατρίβουσιν.

viro sane docto in adnotationibus ad schol. Theocr. (pp. 143-144 ed. Dübn.) locus scholiastae Theocritei corruptus esse videtur, cum alauda, inquit, non Minervae sacra fuerit. scholiastam autem Platonis ignorat. mihi contra his locis omnibus collatis videntur vestigia hic servata esse commentarii Didymeï integrioris, ex quo uberrime deduxit schol. Platonis, qui utriusque nomina deae conservaverit et Terrae et Minervae.

non aliena videbantur esse numina Vestae ac Telluris. sic enim explicat scholiasta verbum Κουροτρόφω, *Theom.* 299: εἴτε τῇ γῇ εἴτε τῇ ἑστία, ὁμοίως πρὸ τοῦ Διὸς θύουσιν αὐτῇ.<sup>1</sup> iterum vestigia commentarii in comoediam antiqui unusquisque fortasse hic agnoscere volet, cum apud comicos<sup>2</sup> illud ὦ γῇ καὶ θεοί saepius offendat iusiurandum. ceterum vide quod comprobare conatus sum infra, p. 157.

Ceris autem dona plane videntur cum Telluris mixta *Av.* 970: Πανδώρα· τῇ γῇ. ἐπειδὴ πάντα τὰ πρὸς τὸ ζῆν δωρεῖται, R. ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ζείδωρος καὶ ἀνησιδώρα, V. quae Hesychius et Photius s. Πανδώρα integra ad verbum exscripserunt, qua re sine dubio e lexico Theonis, Didymo auctore, haec defluerunt.

## II.—DE DIIS OLYMPIIS.

### Ἀφροδίτη.

De Venere ex Asia aut Papho Cypri urbe in Graecorum religionem cultumque adscita scholiasta quidem nihil memorat, nimirum quod illud Κυπρογένεια appellativum in Lysistrata sola exstitit, quam in fabulam scholia adhuc exilia curtaque adservantur. sed quoniam formam Τριτογένεια simillimam de Minervae ad *Eg.* 1189 explicavit, huiusque ortum deae prope Tritonem lacum rettulit, conicere licet hic quoque in commentariis vetustioribus ad *Lys.* 551 olim de Venere Cypria disputatum esse, quae opinio eo firmatur, quod in *Lys.* 347 ne Τριτογένεια quidem explicatur.

neque enim in schol. *Av.* de hac dea notitia manet integra, nam in *Av.* 1251 Ravennas exhibet haec: εἰς Πορφυρίων· ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁ γίγας

<sup>1</sup> infra, pp. 118, 129.

<sup>2</sup> vid. Antyllum ap. Athen. 3, p. 118 E; anonymum ap. eundem, 13, 570 D.

ὁ τῷ Διὶ πολεμήσας, ὃν ἐχειρώσατο Ἀφροδίτῃ,<sup>1</sup> quae, etiam si illud Ἀφροδίτῃ pro Ἀφροδίτῃ aliorum codicum legamus, ut Iovem intellegamus Veneris causa Porphyrionem subegisse, tamen a Ps.-Apollodoro, qui et Iovem illum fulmine percussisse, Herculem autem sagittis confecisse tradiderit, prorsus discrepant.<sup>2</sup> locum igitur in Ravennate servatum plane esse mutilum patet, quem tamen ex alio scholio ad *Av.* 553 complere licet. ibi enim legimus haec: ὁ Κεβριόνα· ἐπιτηδείως δὲ τὸν πορφυρίωνα παρέλαβεν, καὶ ὅτι ὄρνις καὶ ὅτι εἰς τῶν γιγάντων ὁμοίος τῷ Κεβριόνῃ, ὃν ἐχειρώσατο ἡ Ἀφροδίτῃ. ergo verbum ὃν non ad Porphyrionem, sed ad Cebrionen spectat, atque illa ὁμοίος — Κεβριόνῃ e Ravennate ad v. 1252 exciderunt.<sup>3</sup>

at ne Cebriones quidem gigas aliis ex auctoribus mihi notus est.<sup>4</sup> Kockius vero gigantem aliquem in fabulis Atticis vulgo traditum hoc loco putat esse fusum cum Porphyrione. et videtur mihi quidem vir summus partim in veritatem incidisse; nam quae scholiasta de Cebrione adfert ea tota e poetae verbis ipse finxit, Cebrionen autem gigantem fuisse ne poeta quidem aperte dicit, quam ob rem non ineptum mihi videtur aliam e Pausaniae Atticis (i. 14. 7 fin.) interpretationem quaerere; ibi enim periegetes, δῆμος δὲ ἐστίν, inquit, Ἀθηναίοις Ἀθμονίων, οἱ Πορφυρίωνα (noli hunc eundem atque illum putare) ἐτι πρότερον Ἀκταίου βασιλεύσαντα τῆς Οὐρανίας (h.e. Ἀφροδίτης) φασὶ τὸ παρὰ σφίσιν ἱερὸν ἰδρύσασθαι. λέγουσιν δὲ ἀνὰ τοὺς δῆμους καὶ ἄλλα οὐδὲν ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τὴν πόλιν ἔχοντες. quibus satis liquet historias de Venere ac Porphyrione alias aliis in locis pervulgatas esse, illumque Cebrionen, qui nullam re vera cum Porphyrione societatem habebat, heroem quendam Atticis fabulis cognitum fuisse.

atque alium velim locum huc adferre, qui nullas licet ad fabulas pertineat, testimonium tamen est rei satis gravis unicum<sup>5</sup>: *Ach.* 992

<sup>1</sup> ita in R. scriptum est; vid. Martin, *Scolies*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Strab. vii., frag. 27 (ii. p. 462, Mein.). et dissimilia refert schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 8. 23.

<sup>3</sup> [Immo rectius putabimus haec verba ad *Av.* 553 perperam esse inserta, et ὃν pronomen ad Porphyrionem respicere. Etenim testimonio Pausaniae, quem paulo post laudat noster Gulickius, sat apparet aliquid fuisse commercii inter Venerem et Porphyrionem, sive is monstrum fuit seu heros Atticus. Neque enim illud veri simile, duos fuisse Porphyriones. — F. D. A.]

<sup>4</sup> Stoll. ap. Roscher. s. Kebriones illius mentionem omisit (p. 1012).

<sup>5</sup> vid. Brunn, *Gesch. d. Gr. Künstler*, ii. 53.



(R. V. Suid. s. ἀνθέμων), Ζεύξις ὁ ζωγράφος ἐν τῇ κατὰ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἔγραψεν Ἐρωτα ὠραιότατον, ἐστειμένον ῥόδοις. ego equidem de templo Veneris quae dicitur ἑταίρας scholiastam cogitare credo. nam de illo Piraei Veneri Uraniae dicato (schol. *Pac.* 145) hic quidem non agitur. neque enim illud quod Pausanias (1. 14. 7) memorat fanum Veneris Uraniae noster significat, primum quod ille ἱερὸν, hic autem ναόν id appellat, deinde quod, cum huius statuam deae a Phidia factam commemoraverit, Zeuxidis picturam, hac sane haud minus insignem futuram, praetermisit. denique nec ad Veneris aedem Pandemi haec licet referre, cum idem Pausanias (1. 22. 3), dum alias quidem Veneris et Suadelae effigies tractat, de hac tabula silet. opus autem Zeuxidis in aede qualis fuit Veneris Hetaerae<sup>1</sup> ab improbis praecipue celebrata, quia ille non tam ad mores instruendos quam ad animos captandos pinxisse fertur,<sup>2</sup> credibile est exstitisse. ac Didymum de hoc templo quaesisse ex Hesychio Photioque constat, quorum vero hic tradit ἑταίρας Ἀφροδίτης ἱερὸν Ἀθήνησιν· ἀπὸ τοῦ συνάγειν ἑταίρους καὶ ἑταίρας. ille tandem cuiusnam doctrinam secutus est? hoc certe ac manifeste ex Athenaeo (571 C) elucet; nam hic, quem Didymi scientiam compilasse consentaneum est,<sup>3</sup> auctoritatem Apollodori velut si ipse hunc legisset sic adfert: ἀπὸ τῆς παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καλουμένης Ἑταίρας Ἀφροδίτης. περὶ ἧς φησιν ὁ Ἀθηναῖος Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν θεῶν (*FHG*, i. 431) οὕτως· Ἑταίραν δὲ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, τὴν τοὺς ἑταίρους καὶ τὰς ἑταίρας συνάγουσαν. quod si res ita se habet, non possum quin nostrum quoque scholium referam inter Apollodorea.

de feriis in Veneris et Adonidis honorem habitis quae Adonia vocantur agitur schol. *Pac.* 420,<sup>4</sup> *Lys.* 389, 396, 898. hanc ad rem spectat etiam, ut opinor, scholium *Plut.* 179, cuius, quippe quod causas narrat cur Veneris delubrum illius Ἀνοσίας in Thessalia ob mulierum facinus dicatum sit, non alienum a proposito videtur hoc loco meminisse: καὶ φασιν ὅτι ζηλοτυπούσαι αἱ Θετταλαὶ γυναῖκες ἐφόβευσαν αὐτήν (h.e. Laida meretricem), ξυλίναις χελώναις τύπτουσαι ἐν

<sup>1</sup> Hesych. Phot. s. Ἑταίρας Ἀφροδίτης; Philetaerus comicus ap. Athen., p. 559 A.

<sup>2</sup> Aristot. *Poet.* 6, ὁ μὲν γὰρ Πολύγνωτος ἀγαθὸς ἡθοποιός, ἡ Ζεύξις γραφὴ οὐδὲν ἔχει ἡθός, ex quo intellegere licet a Zeuxidis ingenio opera flagitiosa haud aliena fuisse.

<sup>3</sup> vid. Christ, *Gr. Litt.*, p. 540.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Bekk. *Anec.* 345. 31.

τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, πανηγύρεως οὔσης ἐν ᾗ ἄνδρες οὐ παραγένοντο. διὸ τούτου ἕνεκα λοιμὸς κατέλαβε τὴν Θετταλίαν ἕως ὕστερον ἱερὸν ἐποίησαν ἀνοσίας Ἀφροδίτης, ἐπειδὴ αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀνόσιον τετολμήκασιν φόνον.<sup>1</sup> quibus vero Polemonem fuisse auctorem iam aliis visum est comparantibus Athenaeum 13, p. 589 (= Polemon. frag. xx, Pr.), quam opinionem corroborat Helladius ap. Phot. Bibl. 872 (pp. 533–534, Bekk.), qui Polemonis sententiam e Didymo (cf. 872, init.) laudaverat. ergo hoc scholium, licet e Ravennate Venetoque exciderit, cum tamen Suidas referat s. Χελώνη, ex integrioribus Didymi commentariis in codices inferiores deductum esse affirmare non dubito.

ferias quas tum cum Laida invidia impulsae “ligneis scabellis” interfecerunt mulieres celebrabant scholiasta certe non nominat; scimus tantum nefas fuisse mares adesse atque concelebrare. sed haud dubium est quin Adonia, quibus sacris viros non adesse patet ex poeta (*Lys.* 392<sup>2</sup>), hoc quoque loco significantur. quae si ita sint, illud ξυλίναις χελώναις magis intellegamus; nam quod viri docti dixerunt, his verbis intellegenda esse scabella lignea, ratione caret. non enim scabella, sed pulvinaria parva vel lectulos quosdam<sup>3</sup> equidem ea puto fuisse, in quibus quasi lectisterniis positas Adonidis et Veneris imagines portarent mulieres, ut priore die feriarum amores atque conubium eorum ante oculos repraesentarent,<sup>4</sup> postridie autem imitarentur eius mortem doloremque Veneris.

Adonidis apro interfecti mentionem facit schol. Ven. *Ach.* 793, de historia autem tacet: πολλοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὐ θύουσι χοίρους τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ, ὥς βδελυττομένη διὰ τὸν Ἀδωνιν αὐτόν.<sup>5</sup> vide sis quam scite ac docte de hac re noster loquatur: nam πολλοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, inquit, h.e. non omnes, suam Veneri victimam esse ingratam credunt, ex quibus constat illum nonnullos saltem intellexisse Graecos suam aut aprum deae immolare. cuius sane rei testimonia certa, etiam si rara, apud scriptores comperi antiquos. nam Veneri sues apud

<sup>1</sup> cf. Plut. *Amat.* 21, qui tamen aedem Veneris dicit ἀνδροφόνον.

<sup>2</sup> cf. schol. ad loc.; Plut. *Alc.* 18. 3, *Nic.* 13. 9.

<sup>3</sup> cf. illam vocem idem indicantem χελωνίδα ap. Iudith. 14. 14, ubi de Holo-  
phernis cadavere dicitur ἐπὶ τῆς χελωνίδος νεκρόν, quod false interpretatur Suidas ἐπὶ  
τοῦ οὐδοῦ τῆς θύρας vid. Fabricium in Sext. Empir. adv. Math. i. 246 (p. 654, Bekk.).

<sup>4</sup> Theocr. 15. Adonidem in pulvinari reclinantem videas in *Mus. Greg.* i. tab. 93.

<sup>5</sup> Ps.-Apollod. 3. 14. 4.

Argivos immolatas esse sacris quae ὑσθήρια vocarentur factis testatur Callimachus.<sup>1</sup> itidem apud Aspendios quoque Argivorum colonos morem obtinuisse hunc dicit Dionysius Periegetes.<sup>2</sup> tum si alium conferas comicum Antiphanem (1. 61 K), nostrum videbis e toto corpore commentariorum in comoediam veterem et novam quae dicitur haec usurpasse; is enim Antiphanes eadem de Cyprii testatur.<sup>3</sup> quod si hoc e comoedia antiqua testimonium allatum est, referendum ad Didymum sine dubio est, cum etiam Hesychius<sup>4</sup> scire videatur eadem. quae porro ipsum ex Apollodoro Didymum cognovisse has propter causas puto. sues Veneri Castnietidi sacrificatos esse, teste Callimacho, dicit Strabo (9, p. 438), qui deinceps his pergit verbis: οἱ δ' ὕστερον ἤλεγξαν οὐ μίαν Ἀφροδίτην μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλείους ἀποδεδεγμένας τὸ ἔθος τοῦτο. at illo οἱ δ' ὕστερον Apollodorum esse intellegendum iam ostendit Niesius,<sup>5</sup> ut illum quidem pateat in Veneris religionem non Castniae solum sed etiam aliis in locis morem receptum hunc esse cognovisse. haec vero citavi verba ut disceptationem apud litteratos antiquos quandam hac de re exstitisse monerem, quam fortasse sub illo πολλοί latere cernamus.

Stoicis autem, qui cum fabulis tum ingeniis deorum ἐξ ἀλληγοριῶν id est per quandam significationem explicandis gauderent tribuenda videtur esse sententia schol. *Pac.* 40, ut satis arbitror me posse monstrare nostro cum Cornuto collato:

Schol. *Pac.* 40, R. et V.

μύροις μὲν γὰρ ἡ θεὸς ἡδεται.  
διὸ καὶ τοὺς ὕας ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι  
φαιμεν τῆς θεοῦ, βορβορώδεις γάρ,  
προσφιλεῖς δὲ τὰς πελειάδας διὰ τὸ  
τιθασὸν καὶ καθαρὸν αὐτῶν.

Cornut. *N. D.* 24.

ἀνάπαλιν δ' ὅς διὰ τὴν ἀκαθαρ-  
σίαν ἀλλοτρία αὐτῆς εἶναι δοκεῖ.  
περιστερᾷ δὲ τῶν ὀρνέων χαίρει  
μάλιστα, τῷ καθαρὸν εἶναι τὸ ζῶον  
καὶ φιλοφρονητικόν.

<sup>1</sup> ap. Athen. 3, pp. 95 F-96 A.

<sup>2</sup> ἐνθα συνοκτονίησι Διωνυαίην ἱλάσονται, v. 853; cf. Bernhardt ad loc., p. 760. mirificum illud sacrificium non videtur Aspendiis alius attribuisse; sed optime Dionysius meminit, cuius quasi fortuito possunt indicio civitatis origines Argivae restaurari.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Joh. Lyd. *de mens.* 4. 45; W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, i. 272; Creuzer-Guignaut, lib. vi, c. 5, p. 662; Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii. 51.

<sup>4</sup> s. Ἀφροδισία ἄγρα; cf. Diogenian. i. 89, Eust. *II.* 1183. 17.

<sup>5</sup> *Mus. Rhén.* 32. 267, 275.

de Veneris in promunturio Κωλιάδι quod nominatur cultu codex Rav., id quod mirum est,<sup>1</sup> plura quam Venetus tradit, cum de nominis origine haec refert (*Nub.* 52): Κωλιάς<sup>2</sup> ναός ἐστι τῆς Ἀφροδίτης οὕτω καλούμενος,<sup>3</sup> ἀπὸ τοῦ συμβεβηκότος τὴν προσηγορίαν λαβών. νεανίας γάρ τις Ἀττικὸς αἰλὸς ὑπὸ Τυρρηνῶν καὶ δεσμώτης δουλεύων παρ' αὐτοῖς,<sup>4</sup> ἐρασθείσης αὐτοῦ τῆς θυγατρὸς τοῦ ἔχοντος καὶ ἀπολυσάσης ἦλθεν εἰς οἰκίαν,<sup>5</sup> καὶ οὕτως ἐλευθερωθεὶς εὐχαριστήριον τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ τῆς σωτηρίας<sup>6</sup> ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκτῆς ἀφ' ἧς περ ἡρπάγη ναὸν ἰδρύσατο. Κωλιάδα δὲ προσηγόρευσε τὸν τόπον ἀπὸ τῶν κώλων ἃ ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς κατεπονέιτο. quibus etiam addit Suidas: οἱ δέ, ὅτι Ἴωνος θύοντος ἱερεῖον κωλὴν ἱέραξ ἤρπασε καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνῃ τῷ τόπῳ ἐκάθισεν, ὅθεν ὁ τόπος Κωλιάς ἐκλήθη. . . quibus nisus copiis scholium in Veneto corruptum sic scribo: Κωλιάς δὲ ἐκλήθη ὅτι θύοντος τοῦ Ἴωνος (V. ἱερέως) ἱερεῖον κωλὴν (V. κωλῆς) ἱέραξ ἤρπαζεν καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνῃ (V. ἐπέκεινα) τῷ τόπῳ ἐπεκαθίσθη, ὅθεν ὁ Κωλιάς ἐκλήθη. quod in codicibus inferioribus e superioribus amplius confectum est longum mihi est exscribere. maximam vero cum his similitudinem habent Eustathius (in Dionys. P. 591<sup>6</sup>) et Etym. Magn. (550. 41). quis vero auctor fuerit remotior quem his de rebus compilaverit Symmachus<sup>9</sup> incertum est. cum Eustathium quidem manifesto ex isdem quibus codd. inferiores nati sunt libris res cognovisse videamus, Symmachus quin Didymo usus sit nihil dubium est.<sup>10</sup>

quod rursus scholiasta dicit, illud promunturium cum simile esset hominis femori ita nominatum esse an verum sit haud scio. similia apud schol. *Lys.* 2 invenies: Κωλιάδος Ἀφροδίτης ἱερόν ἐστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ. ὁ δὲ τόπος καλεῖται Κωλιάς. ἐστι γὰρ ἐκκείμενος,<sup>11</sup> ὁμοῖος<sup>12</sup> ἀνθρώπου κώλῃ. antiqui utique grammatici e terrae figura nomen ductum esse id censebant, quod fortasse etiam illud Minervae

<sup>1</sup> vid. Zacher, p. 673.

<sup>2</sup> cod. κωλιάς teste Martino, κωλιολ Zachero, corr. Suid.

<sup>3</sup> ita interpunxi.

<sup>4</sup> δουλεύων, παραντά, Suid.

<sup>5</sup> cod. οἰκίαν.

<sup>6</sup> supplevi e Suida.

<sup>7</sup> cod. ἐφ', corr. Suid.

<sup>8</sup> cf. eundem *ad Il.*, p. 324. 3, ὅτι δὲ κῶλα ἰδίως καὶ ἐπὶ ποδῶν, ἢ Κωλιάς Ἀφροδίτῃ θεῶν, κῶλα τοιαῦτα ἐκλύσασα δεσμοῦ, ὡς ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται.

<sup>9</sup> cf. Stein, p. ii.

<sup>10</sup> cf. Harpocrat. s. Κωλιάς.

<sup>11</sup> ita scripsi, Steinio praeunte, pro illo ἐγκείμενος (Dind.); cf. Hesych., Phot., *Suid.* s.v., Eust. in *Dion.*, p. 591. Hesychius ἀκτῇ, inquit, εἰς θάλασσαν ἐξέχουσα.

<sup>12</sup> ὁμοῖος R, ὁμοῖος alii.

epitheton *ζωστηρία*<sup>1</sup> docet, cum Preller-Robert<sup>2</sup> id quoque ad terram in formam cinguli curvatam spectare arbitretur. atqui mos erat antiquis haud ignotus, utcumque verbum aliquid vix intellectum invenissent, historias ad hoc explicandum commenticias fingere ut causa nominis probaretur.<sup>3</sup> itaque quoniam ignorabant sane veteres illud *Κωλιάδα* ductum esse a nomine Hymetti montis pristino et Pelasgico *Καλιά*, ubi Venus antiquitus maximo cum studio culta esset, alii quidem alias causas rettulerunt.<sup>4</sup>

de Genetyllide dea haec ad *Λυδ.* 52 mirifice scripta legimus : οἱ μὲν τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἀξιοῦσι θεῶν μίαν εἶναι διὰ τὸ γενέσεως αὐτὴν εἶναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις αἰτίαν προΐσταμένην τῶν γάμων καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς γάμοις μυστηρίων, ὅθεν καὶ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις Βένης γενετρικῆς ἐν τοῖς φόροις ἐστίν, κτλ. immo Veneris cultum Genetricis ut matris Aeneadum primus instituit divus Iulius A.U.C. 708<sup>5</sup> neque umquam, quod sciam, velut Iunonem Lucinam vel Dianam Genitalem eam invocaverunt puerperae.<sup>6</sup> scholium igitur hoc in Veneto conservatum e recentissimis illatum est.

at minime certe mirum est si Venerem cum deabus quae parturientibus praesideant apud scholiastam coniungi reperimus, primum quod fanum illius deae templo Cereris quoque in Coliade promunturio adiacebat, ut utraque inter deos *γαμηλίους* Thesmophoriis simul invocarentur.<sup>7</sup> deinde quod Venus ipsa a Graecis interdum ut Ilithyia vel Iuno Lucina colebatur.<sup>8</sup> scholia autem vetustiora in eo exhibent constantiam, quod poetam fideliter secuta Genetyllidem

<sup>1</sup> *Cl. A.* i. 273.

<sup>2</sup> *Gr. Myth.* i. 194, adn. 5 ad fin.

<sup>3</sup> quae fabulae hodie eleganter dicuntur "aetiologicae." aliam praeterea causam vide ridiculam in Cod. Vat. 1294 (Zacher, p. 609): ἀπὸ τοῦ φθέραις κόρη ἐκ τῶν κοίων ἐκ τῶν τοῦ ἐκκομίσθαι καὶ λυθῆς ἐκ τῆς θεοῦ λεγόμενης Κωλιάδος Ἀφροδίτης ἐκκομίσθαι.

<sup>4</sup> cf. *Σκιά. Κωλίου γένος*, Rosolt, *Gr. Genik.* i. 172.

<sup>5</sup> Preller, *Oracula Rom. Myth.* i. 443.

<sup>6</sup> cf. *Επεικὴν προΐσταται*, *Λευ. v.* 53 Vahl, ubi sic orat Ilia: te sale nata parvum Venia, te genetrix patris nostri, et Serv. *G.* 2. 380: Genetrici vero ἡ ἐκ Κομίας.

<sup>7</sup> Preller, *Oracula Rom. Myth.* p. 355. Daremberg et Saglio, p. 1042.

<sup>8</sup> *Παύς α. v. 2*: Harrison et Verrall, p. 186. cf. illam etymologiam miram ad *Πρόκωμ α. v. 2*: quod ei [Veneri] primum in Cyprio insula templum sit constitutum, vel quia parentibus praesideat, quod Graece *κόμω* parere sit!

ferunt non ipsam esse Venerem, sed deam vel quasi genium cum ea sociatum. vide scholl. *Thesm.* 130, *Nub.* 52, *Lys.* 2, quae inter *Symmachea* tantum refert Stein (p. ii).

deceat vero hoc loco pauca dicere et de Gratiis, quas cum Venere praecipue societatem habuisse et quasi vinculum scit noster (*Pac.* 41), ubi *Ravennas*, Ἀφροδίτης μὲν γὰρ καὶ Χαρίτων πολλή κοινωνία, exhibet. ceterum quod in Veneto cautius traditur δοκεῖ γὰρ πως κοινωνία εἶναι τούτων τῶν θεῶν, nescio an ab alio grammatico scriptum sit doctiore, qui aliis quoque dis eas nonnumquam coniungi sciret.<sup>1</sup> de numero earum scholium Iuntinum (ad *Nub.* 773) quod vulgo fertur tradit; nam etiam aetate illius sculpturae *Claromontanae*<sup>2</sup> Gratias fuisse tres certum est. nomina autem cum noster *Aglaïam*, *Thaliām*, *Suadelām* dederit, *Pausanias* tamen<sup>3</sup> *Hesiodum*<sup>4</sup> commemorat *Aglaïam*, *Thaliām*, *Euphrosynēn* vocasse, addit autem haec: κατὰ ταῦτα δὲ ἐν ἑπεσὶν ἔστι τοῖς Ὀνομακρίτου . . . Ἑρμῆσιάνακτι δὲ τῷ τὰ ἐλεγεία γράψαντι τοσόνδε οὐ κατὰ τὴν τῶν πρότερον δόξαν ἔστιν αὐτῷ πεποιημένον, ὥς ἡ Πειθὼ Χαρίτων εἴη καὶ αὐτὴ μία. qua re nostrum Scholium, licet sit satis recens, e viro aliquo fluxit haud indocto, qui *Suadela* una e *Gratiis* pro *Euphrosyne* memorata eo monstraverit elegicos *Alexandrinus*, quorum in numero *Hermesinactem* fuisse notum est, se inspexisse.

restat ut epitheti mentionem faciam deae proprii in cod. *Puteano* ad *Thesm.* 392 reperti, quod a viris doctis nondum satis animadversum esse videtur. nam ad verbum *μυχοτρόπους*, quo poeta mulieres fallaces et subdolas notat, adnotatum invenio: *μυχία ἡ Ἀφροδίτη*, quod etiam ap. *Guignaut*<sup>5</sup> legitur auctoribus non laudatis, exstatque eodem modo in *Bruchmanni Epithetis Deorum*.

cetera quae de hac dea narrantur omnibus nota sunt et antiquis et recentibus, ut auctores statuere nequeamus. talia sunt quae de donis *Paridis* tradit noster (*Av.* 1104), quae profecto in primis e *Cyprii* poemate cyclico cognita sunt. in his igitur non moramur.

<sup>1</sup> scholl. *Pac.* 456, *Ach.* 989. Gratias (an *Horas*?) cum *Apolline* coniunctas memorat *Paus.* 9. 35. 1; cf. *Harrison et Verrall*, p. 383; *Dar. et Sagl.*, p. 312; *H. Hom. in Ven.* 95.

<sup>2</sup> in *Bibl. Vat.* *Harrison et Verrall*, p. 382.

<sup>3</sup> 9. 35. 3. sic etiam schol. vet. *Pind. Olymp.* 14. 20. <sup>4</sup> *Theog.* 906-908.

<sup>5</sup> *Religions de l'antiquité*, lib. 6, c. 5, p. 661. et *Iunonem* ita appellat, p. 607, adn. 2; cf. p. 566. *Latona* quoque *μυχία* dicitur ap. *Euseb. praep. ev.* iii. 84.

## Ἀπόλλων.

Apollinis Milesii Didymis praecipue culti mentionem facit schol. *Lys.* 1281: ἐπὶ Διδύμων (ita) τῆς Μιλήτου τόπου Διδυμαῖος Ἀπόλλων καλεῖται. Steinius vero Blaydesio praeunte Διδύμων scripsit.

Apollo Νάπαιος a Lesbii celebratus memoratur a schol. *Nub.* 144, ubi Lobeckii correctura a Dindorfio recepta est. noster enim, postquam Apollonii sententiam Molonis filii refutavit, oracula non genuina esse nisi versibus epicis vel hexametris scripta sint, exemplum Pelopis adfert: ἐν Λέσβῳ δὲ ναπαίου<sup>1</sup> Ἀπόλλωνος ὁ δοθεὶς Πέλοπι (nempe χρησμός), αἰτοῦντος αὐτὸν ἀνάθημα τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἄρνα τὴν χρυσήν, ἕτερα παρέχοντι κειμήλια. historiam de agna illa aurea quae fratribus Atreo et Thyestae rixam conviciumque praeberet iam narraverat Euripides.<sup>2</sup> non autem hunc, sed Anticlidem virum Alexandrinum vel maxime rerum sacrarum studiosum,<sup>3</sup> in libro qui inscribebatur Νόστοι, noster est secutus.

atque scientiam illius dei apud Lesbios solum culti itaque nominati — qui saltus incoleret pecudesque tueretur quae ibi pascerentur — Hellanico<sup>4</sup> certe omnes debuerunt antiqui, quoniam deum hoc nomine alibi cultum non videntur novisse.<sup>5</sup> ego autem saltus omnes temporibus priscis Apollini pastori sacros fuisse arbitror, ut ubicumque pascua gregesque essent et numen quod eis praesideret praesto foret. alios igitur Apollines Ναπαίους fuisse exspectandum est, atque plus semel animadverti illud νάπος etiam apud Pindarum una cum Apolline memoratum esse.<sup>6</sup> Apollinem pastorem venerabantur antiqui ut pestem gregibus averteret. cum autem vulgo pestilentias oriri crederent a pecoribus atque inde in homines incidere,<sup>7</sup> eundem deum in urbibus et vel maxime Athenis<sup>8</sup> colebant

<sup>1</sup> Lobeck, *Ag.* p. 267, pro γοναίου.

<sup>2</sup> *Or.* 998; cf. 812, *El.* 718, *I. T.* 812, 191.

<sup>3</sup> vid. Susemihl, *Gr. Litt. d. Alex. Zeit.* 1. 358. fortasse scholiasta Anticlidis scientiam per Istrum delibavit. Wellmann, *de Istro Callimachio*, pp. 43, 63–67.

<sup>4</sup> ἐν Λεσβιακοῖς, Steph. B. s. Νάπη.

<sup>5</sup> atque ita res se habet de illo Apolline Μαλλόεντι. Steph. B. s. Μαλλέος, auctore eodem Hellanico. cf. Bekk. *An.* 3. 1187.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 5. 38 et 6. 9; Schol. Pind. *P.* 1. et 5. 4; Didymi *Fragm.* p. 240.

<sup>7</sup> Schol. *Il.* 21. 448.

<sup>8</sup> Paus. 1. 3. 4; cf. 8. 41. 8.

ut Ἀλεξικακόν aut Ἀποτρόπαιον, quod memorant scholl. *Pac.* 422, *Plut.* 438, 359, cod. Par. *Plut.* 854.

haud dubium est quin Didymus de Apolline qui Λύκειος dicitur id repetierit quod veteres plerique sentiebant, cum illius nominis non a lucendo, sed a lupis originem duceret. nam et in schol. *Soph. Electr.* 6. et apud Hesych. s. λυκοκτόνος lupos esse deo sacros affirmat, Aristarchi principio, qui haec animalia infesta esse Apollini censebat, sententia refutata. scholium igitur ad *An.* 369<sup>1</sup> ex ipso Didymo ductum adferendum est: τὸ παλαιὸν τοὺς λύκους ἀπέκτεινον ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, καὶ νόμος ἦν λυκοκτονεῖν. διὸ ὁ μὲν φονέων τέκνον λύκου τάλατον ἐλάμβανεν, ὁ δὲ τέλειον δύο. ὅθεν καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα λύκειον καὶ λυκοκτόνον φασίν. cum vero Eustathius ac Suidas<sup>2</sup> formam ἀπέκτεινον conservarint, illam apud nostrum quoque legere malo, quia ipsis verbis perspicere licet haud dubie vestigia legis alicuius priscae, quae stipendium pro lupis caesis iubebat dari.

absurdum scilicet omnibus videbitur qui hanc rem sine opinione iam praeiudicata indagaverint nexum et societatem, ut ita dicam, dei Apollinis cum lupis in mentem cultorum recentioribus tantum temporibus incidisse credere.<sup>3</sup> ipse enim Roscherus<sup>4</sup> lupum in Apollinis religionem immissum fatetur non per falsam etymologiam solum, sed propter causam aliquam quae iam diu perobscura atque adhuc ignota sit. ceterum hoc est observandum, lupum fuisse symbolum vel imaginem victoris aequae atque ferae trucidis saevique.<sup>5</sup> sed quam ob rem lupus deusque una religione cultuque ita coniuncti sint e moribus elucet ac notionibus gentium barbarorum qui hodie usque haud dissimilia credant. sunt enim quibus videtur homini cuique, genti, nationi, denique populis cunctis animum quendam extra suum corpus in beluis residere, quae cum vitas tueantur

<sup>1</sup> cf. Suid. s. φεισόμεθα; Eust. 1604. 11: φαιεὶν φαιερόν, κλειεὶν κλειρόν. οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ κτείνω κτέννω, οὗ χρήσις καὶ ἐν τῷ "τὸ παλαιὸν λύκους ἀπέκτεινον ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ," καὶ "νόμος ἦν λυκοκτονεῖν. καὶ τῷ κτείναντι μὲν τέκνον λύκου τάλατον δίδουσαι, τῷ δὲ τέλειον, δύο."

<sup>2</sup> tribus codd. Choeroboscus ap. Cram. *An. Ox.* 2. 233, formam κτέννω Aeolicam dicit.

<sup>3</sup> quod tamen sentire videntur, Müll. *Dor.* ii. 304–305; Welck. *G. G.* i. 431, 473; Curt. *Gr. Etym.* 161; Dar. et Sagl., p. 317.

<sup>4</sup> Rosch. *Lex.* p. 443.

<sup>5</sup> Mannhardt, *Antike Wald- u. Feld-Kulte*, 336.



curentque, tum idcirco ab eis coluntur. talia quidem animalia venerabantur, ut notum est, indigenae quae patriam olim nostram incolebant, quae suo sermone "totem" barbarice nominabant. cuius vero religionis mirae sane atque incultae vestigiorum apud Graecos obliti sunt homines post elegantes urbanique facti, ut illum deum priscum Arcadum et Atticorum rusticorum ei qui Lucis vel Solis et sibi et populis Asiaticis numen fuisset plane adsimularent.<sup>1</sup>

historiam Ionis Apolline nati atque Creusa Erechthei filia Xuthique uxore tangit schol. *Av.* 1527: κατ' Ἑλλησπίν ἐστι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. δέον γὰρ εἰπεῖν, ὁ πατρῷος Ἀπόλλων, ἢ ἄλλος τις τῶν θεῶν. πατρῶον δὲ τιμῶσιν Ἀπόλλωνα Ἀθηναῖοι, ἐπεὶ Ἴων, ὁ πολέμαρχος Ἀθηναίων, ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Κρεούσης τῆς Ξούθου ἐγένετο. adde quoque schol. *Nub.* 1468.

verbis illis ἢ . . . θεῶν concludas nostrum alios quoque censuisse deos praeter Apollinem Athenis πατρῷους nominatos esse, quam nonnullos opinionem inter Athenienses ipsos habuisse constat.<sup>2</sup> deinde voce πολέμαρχος id exprimitur, quod Ionem propter temporum discrepantias Attici in numerum suorum heroum dubitabant adsciscere,<sup>3</sup> quem advenam in Atticam pervenisse recte rettulit Ponticus Heraclides 1. 1, qui de hac re verbo utitur συνοικήσας.<sup>4</sup> nunc restat ut scholiastae auctorem quaeramus. cum enim historici atque Atticarum rerum<sup>5</sup> scriptores Ionem fuisse Xuthi, non Apollinis filium tradidissent, illos quidem nostrum neglexisse manifestum est. sed Harpocratio eadem fere, quae scholiasta tradit, perhibet auctore Aristotele; hic autem, quoad invenire potui, primus Ionem πολέμαρχον

<sup>1</sup> Plin. *H. N.* 8. 82; E. Abbot, *Hist. Gr.* i. 68; Dar. et Sagl., p. 314 (s. Apollon); Harrison et Verrall, p. 219. Iuppiter quoque Lycaeus apud Arcades colebatur, Dar. et Sagl., p. 317. lupos in Arcadia permultos fuisse testatur Ps.-Apollod. 2. 5. 6. qui tamen totemismum, ut ita dicam, apud Graecos fuisse negaverint hoc respiciant Porphyrii (*de Abstin.* 4. 16, p. 254 N.): τὴν γὰρ κοινότητα ἡμῶν τὴν πρὸς τὰ ζῷα αἰκνιζόμενοι διὰ τῶν ζῴων ἡμᾶς μὴθεὶν εἰώθασιν, κτλ.

<sup>2</sup> vide sis quo modo Socrates ap. Plat. *Euthyd.* 302 C, Dionysodorum, qui Iovem πατρῷον dixit, reprehendat.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Stein ad Herod. 8. 44, qui verbo de Ione στρατάρχης utitur; sic Eust. ad Dionys. P. 423.

<sup>4</sup> Salmasius igitur in errorem incidit, qui pro οἰκήσαντος ap. Harpocr. Ἀπ. πατρ. οἰκίσαντος legeret; cf. Paus. 1. 31. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Herod. 7. 94, 8. 44; Ephorus ap. Strab., pp. 383, 397; Philoch. ap. Harp. 8. βοηδρομία; Paus. 1. 31. 3, 7. 1. 2.

dixit.<sup>1</sup> huius igitur de libro sumpta quae legimus in schol. *Av.* 1527 et *Nub.* 1468. Aristoteles denique ante oculos habuit Euripidem.<sup>2</sup>

ad eundem arbitror Aristotelem ea quoque referenda esse quae in argumenti parte quarti *Ranarum* nugis ineptisque recentissimi grammatici mixta Apollinis certamen cum Marsya commemorant:<sup>3</sup> ὡς τῷ ὑπὲρ φύσιν Ὀμήρῳ τις ἀνώνυμος ἤριξε Σάτυρος, Ἡσιόδῳ δὲ Κέρκῳ, ἢ πλέον εἰπείν, Εὐρυτος μὲν τοξικῇ, Μαρσύας δὲ μουσικῇ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι, κτλ. nunc conferas Laertium Diogenem (2. 46), qui Aristotelem de similibus altercationibus notabilibus disserentem sic laudat: τοῦτῳ (h.e. Socrati) τις, καθά φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τρίτῳ περὶ ποιητικῆς, ἐφιλονέκει Ἀντίλοχος Δῆμιος καὶ Ἀντιφῶν ὁ τερατοσκόπος, ὡς Πυθαγόρα Κύλων Κροτωνιάτης· καὶ Σάαγρος Ὀμήρῳ ζῶντι, ἀποθανόντι δὲ Ξενοφάνη ὁ Κολοφώνιος· καὶ Κέρκῳ Ἡσιόδῳ ζῶντι, τελευτήσαντι δὲ ὁ προειρημένος Ξενοφάνης, κτλ.

pro illo musici nomine Σάτυρος a scholiasta exhibito vix sufficit illud Diogenis Σάαγρος subponere, cum ne hanc quidem formam omnes codices praebeant, quam apud Eustathium (*Il.* 4. 20) iterum falsa scriptura legimus: ὡς καὶ Ἀλκιανὸς ἱστορεῖ, μετὰ Ὀρφείᾳ καὶ Μουσαῖον Σάαγρος γέγονε ποιητής. quod si eius auctorem Aelianum<sup>4</sup> ipsum scrutamur, hunc non Σάαγρον, sed Οἶαγρον re vera scripsisse apparebit: Οἶαγρός τις ἐγένετο ποιητής μετ' Ὀρφείᾳ καὶ Μουσαῖον, ὃς λέγεται τὸν Τρωικὸν πόλεμον πρῶτος ἔσαι, μέγιστος οὗτος ὑποθέσεως λαβόμενος καὶ ἐπιτολήσας ταύτη. cuius verba extrema diligenter sunt consideranda, quippe quae, sicut noster, testantur insolentiam illius Oeagri, qui ultro cum ipso Homero contenderet. quibus locis expensis mihi quidem persuasum est scholiastae verbum Σάτυρος esse in illud Οἶαγρος mutandum.<sup>5</sup>

Apollinis pugnam Delphicam cum Pythone serpente leviter perstringere videtur scholiasta ad *Pac.* 453,<sup>6</sup> quem ex ipsius verbis Callimachum secutum esse patet. praeterea notandum est Apollodorum

<sup>1</sup> *Resp. Athen.* 3. 2; cf. *Paus.* 2. 14. 2.

<sup>2</sup> quae ad schol. *Av.* 1527 attinent, iam indicarunt Kaibel et Wilamowitz (frag. i), causis rationibusque non allatis. omiserunt schol. *Nub.* 1468, quem locum huc pertinere ex *Polluc.* 8. 85 patet. Adde *Nub.* 984, *Pac.* 46.

<sup>3</sup> *Dind.-Düb.*, p. 274 a, 35.

<sup>4</sup> *V. H.* 14. 21.

<sup>5</sup> Oeagrus nominatur Orphei pater (*Ap. Rh.* 2. 703; 1. 23, alii).

<sup>6</sup> scholium hoc omissum est in Rav. et Ven.

saltem pro fonte de hac re habere eum non potuisse. ille<sup>1</sup> enim etymologiam sive originem verbi ἡπαιών quam dissimillimam profert, ut deus ἥμιος nominatus sit ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ κόσμον ἔσθαι καὶ ἰέναι, qua sententia ille ab Aristarcho, Callimacho, Timotheo, nempe ut Stoicis imbutus rationibus, distat.<sup>2</sup>

de Apolline qui dicitur Ἀγνείως quae noster tradit (*Vesp.* 875; cf. *Thesm.* 489) e Dieuchida historico Megarensi illata sunt. is quidem ut qui eo tempore scriberet cum fabulis commenticulisque admodum delectarentur homines, res gestas cum fabulis saepius permiscebat.<sup>3</sup> cuius autem ex verbis, licet sint corrupta a librariis, facile illum perspicitur cultus originem Apollinis Ἀγνείως, id est qui viis praesidet, e Doribus duxisse. atque eodem ex fonte hausit Harpocratonis auctor.<sup>4</sup>

hoc vero notandum est, nostro quidem semper fere curae esse palam dicere Apollinem esse eundem ac Solem,<sup>5</sup> quod non accidisset si temporibus ille recentioribus scripsisset, cum iam ii di plane apud scriptores confusi essent.<sup>6</sup> qua re nusquam apud scholiastam verbum opus est Ἥλιον in Ἀπόλλωνα corrigere, id quod voluerunt quidam ad *Eq.* 729 et *Plut.* 1054.

Solem atque Apollinem quamquam non discrevit Philochorus,<sup>7</sup> non tamen ea ad illum, sed ad Apollodorum quae dixit scholiasta referenda suspicor. hunc enim de Solis Apollinisque similitudine fuse ac studiose disseruisse docet Heraclides in *Allegoriis Homericis*.<sup>8</sup>

an hoc quoque scholium ex eodem Apollodoro ductum sit pro certo nequeo equidem affirmare: *Pac.* 410, ἐπιεικῶς δὲ οἱ βάρβαροι

<sup>1</sup> frag. 7, ap Macrob. i. 17, 19, in libro quarto decimo περὶ θεῶν. Ephorus quidem hanc historiam ita tractabat ut veras causas rationesque rei fabulari inmiseret. Strab. 9. 422; Christ, p. 279; Busolt,<sup>2</sup> i. 157.

<sup>2</sup> E. M. 469. 53; schol. *Il.* 10. 391; Bergk. *P. L. G.* 3. 624. de paeane cf. etiam scholl. *Pac.* 555, *Av.* 772, *Plut.* 636.

<sup>3</sup> Susemihl i. 532.

<sup>4</sup> Qui Dieuchidam ἐν τῇ γ' τῶν Μεγαρικῶν laudat. cf. Suid.; Bekk. *An.* 331. 32; Zonarae *Lex.*, p. 20.

<sup>5</sup> *Nub.* 595, 571; *Pac.* 410; *Plut.* 8.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Bekk. *An.* 331. 33, 443. 33; Tzetz. *Lyc.* 208.

<sup>7</sup> E. M. 768 = Phot. et Suid. s. Τριτοπάτορες.

<sup>8</sup> *Alleg. Hom.* 6-7, ἡκρίβωται δ' ἡ περὶ τούτων ἀπόδειξις καὶ Ἀπολλοδώρου, περὶ πάσαν ἱστορίαν ἀνδρὶ δεινῷ.

τόν τε ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην θεῶν μᾶλλον πάντων σέβουσι. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν Δῆλον καὶ τὴν Ἐφεσον οὐ διελυμήναντο. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἥλιος Ἀπόλλων ἐνενόμιστο, ἡ δὲ Ἄρτεμις σελήνη. quae vero ad Apollinem atque Delum insulam attinent, eorum auctor est Herodotus.<sup>1</sup> Persas autem templo quoque Ephesio pepercisse verum licet sit,<sup>2</sup> quo pacto noster quidem cognoverit plane me fugit. Timaeum fortasse Tauro-  
menitam, quem potissimum de beneficiis quaesisse quibus Persae illi templo favebant apparet ex ipsa reprehensione Artemidori apud Strabonem<sup>3</sup> commemorata, auctor inspexit scholiastae. neque inter se congruunt hic et Diodorus,<sup>4</sup> qui Persas refert Graecorum urbes adgressos aedificiaque populos omnia delubrum celeberrimum deae solum quae Ἡμῑά diceretur integrum reliquisse. eum autem de locis Aegaeo mari adiacentibus disserentem auctorem secutum esse Apollodorum monuit Bethius.<sup>5</sup>

Aristaeum filium Apollinis et Cyrenes novit schol. *Eg.* 894, qui eum laserpicii usum herbae pretiosissimae<sup>6</sup> primum invenisse solus,<sup>7</sup> ni fallor, docet. sed alia quidem alii memorant bona ab illo inventa hominibusque donata, quorum venationem schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 9, 113, Diod. 4. 81, schol. Ap. Rh. 2. 498<sup>8</sup> una commemorant. at scholiasta Pindari in eo cum nostro convenit, quod Aristaeum et μέλιτος εὐρετήν appellat; his autem donis addit Diodorus (4. 81) γάλακτος πῆξιν, vel caseum. his igitur comparatis rebus facile perspicitur altera ex parte scholiastas Pindari Aristophanisque, ex altera vero Diodorum et Apollonii interpretem ad eundem fontem congressos, varia et quae sibi cuique placeret sumpsisse. at scholiastam Apollonii et Diodorum usque libellum a Dionysio qui dicitur Scytobrachione saeculo fere septimo post urbem conditam scriptum, sicut Ps.-Apollodorum atque Hyginum, ante oculos habuisse multis comprobavit indicii Bethius.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 6. 97. cf. schol. *Pac.* 407, 410.

<sup>2</sup> vid. Brisson *de regum Persar. princip.* ii. § 32; Creuzer-Guignaut, lib. iv, c. 4, p. 113; cf. p. 126, adn. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Strab. 14, p. 640.

<sup>4</sup> 5. 62.

<sup>5</sup> *Herm.* xxiv. (1889), p. 402 seqq.

<sup>6</sup> vid. Stein. ad Herod. 4. 169.

<sup>7</sup> nisi quod eadem tradit Suid. s. Σελήνη.

<sup>8</sup> qui auctores laudat Pherecydem, Ariaethum, Agroetam ἐν πρώτῳ Λιβυκῶν, Mnaseam, Acesandrum ἐν τοῖς περὶ Κυρήνης.

<sup>9</sup> Quaestiones Diodoreae, p. 54 sq.

num igitur dubites fateri et Didymum, sive quis potius illa scholia in Pindarum et Aristophanem composuerit, ad eundem Dionysium quasi magistrum remeasse?

Apollinis servitutem quam apud Laomedontem Troianorum regem is una cum Neptuno passus erat iam ab Homero relatam tangit schol. *Av.* 584: μισθοφορεῖ δέ· τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν ἐπεὶ Λαομέδοντα τῆς τευχοδομίας μισθὸν ἤτησεν. cf. *Thesm.* 110: ὃς τὴν Ἴλιον ἐτείχισεν. verbum τευχοδομίας videas unde in scholiastae mentem occurrerit ex *Il.* 21. 444: ἧ τοι ἐγὼ Τρώεσσι πόλιν πέρι τέχως ἴδεια.

non ineptum esse puto duos locos (schol. *Nub.* 133 et *Plut.* 604) proferre, qui cum Didymo attribuendi sunt tum haud satis animadversi sunt a doctis viris: Βοιωτοῖς γὰρ ἀναστάτοις ὑπὸ Θρακῶν γενομένοις καὶ περὶ ἀποικίας μαντευομένοις εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ἐκεῖ κατοικεῖν ἐνθα ἂν ἴδωσι λευκὸν κόρακα, οἱ δ' ἐν Θετταλίᾳ παρὰ τὸν Παγασιτικὸν κόλπον εἶδον περιπταμένους τοὺς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱεροὺς κόρακας, οὓς παῖδες ἀφῆκαν γυψώσαντες ὑπὸ μέθης, καὶ τελεῖσθαι τὸν χρησμὸν φήσαντες ἐνταῦθα κατῴκησαν. sic schol. *Nub.*; eadem habet schol. *Plut.* 604, ubi ἀπὸ Θρακῶν quod codices praebent ego in ὑπό<sup>1</sup> mutaverim. corrige etiam hic illud περὶ τὸν Παγασιτικὸν κόλπον pro παρὰ. neque mihi quidem liquet cur vir summus ad Diod. 19. 53 illud Παγασιτικόν in Παγασητικόν mutaverit. nam forma Παγασιτικόν ex illo Παγασίτη κόλπω ap. Ps.-Dem. xi. 26 firmatur.

haec Didymi verba variis sane modis alii exscripserunt multi, quorum conferas Zenobium (3. 87), unde cum Menandri comici faciat mentionem Didymum manifestum est similia certe etiam si non plane eadem ut proverbium ἐς κόρακας explicaret aliis in partibus commentariorum suorum identidem attulisse. a Zenobio porro<sup>2</sup> certiores facti sumus Aesopum Aristotelemque de causis illius pro-  
verbi oriundi eum legisse. Didymi autem verba neglegenter ut videtur exscripsit in suo lexico Pausanias apud Eust. 1746. 65.

sed alio quoque modo scholiasta noster usui est, quod vir doctus Naberus in Photii editione non satis perspexit. etenim ea quae apud lexicographum mutilate et corrupte tradita ille non exputavit, sic fere apparet esse supplenda, Phot. ἐς κόρακας· Βοιωτοῖς ὁ θεὸς

<sup>1</sup> cf. Herod. 1. 97, 106; 7. 220; Thuc. 1. 12.

<sup>2</sup> = Suid. ἐς Κόρακας.

ἔχρησεν ὅπου ἂν λευκοὶ κόρακες ὀφθῶσιν, ἐκεῖ κατοικεῖν. περὶ (lege παρὰ) δὲ τὸν Παγασιτικὸν (ita) κόλπον ὑπὸ παίδων ἀκάκων γηψωθέντας κόρακας ἰδόντες περιπετομένους (τοὺς) τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος (ἱεροὺς κόρακας), ᾤκησαν ἐκεῖ, καλέσαντες τὸ χωρίον κόρακας.<sup>1</sup>

atque in hunc locum germanum esse arbitror scholium de Amphictyonibus origineque nominis illius Πυλαγόραι introduce, *Nub.* 623: κατὰ πόλιν δ' ἔπεμπον τοὺς θύσοντας (ad concilium Amphictyonum) καὶ συνεδρεύοντας· καὶ ἦσαν οἱ πεμπόμενοι Πυλαγόραι καὶ ἱερομνήμονες. λέγονσι δὲ ὅτι Πυλάδης πρῶτος ἐκρίθη ἐπὶ τῷ Κλυταιμνήστρας φόνῳ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦνομα σχεῖν τὸν τόπον.

ex extremis quidem huius scholii verbis, quae longum erat mihi cuncta exhibere, non temere colligas argumentum de historico aliquo nostrum sumpsisse. Suidas autem s. Πυλαγόραι eadem habet; mox s. Πύλαι et Ἱερομνήμονες simillima ex Harpocrate<sup>2</sup> excerpit, qui rursus suum declarat auctorem his verbis, Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ λ'.

historiam de Pylade supra narratam apud schol. *Trach.* 639 sic scriptam reperies: εἰς τὴν λεγομένην Πυλαίαν, περὶ ἧς Ἀγάθων φησὶ Πυλάδην τὸν Στροφίον πρῶτον συστήσασθαι (R. et Br. κριθῆναι) ἐν τῇ Φωκίδι, καθαιρόμενον τὸ ἐπὶ Κλυταιμνήστρα μύσος, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὴν σύνοδον Πυλαίαν φησὶ προσαγορεύεσθαι.

quae de Apolline qui Λοξίας dicitur apud schol. *Plut.* 8 feruntur ea recentiore quendam grammaticum commentum esse liquet: τῷ δὲ Λοξίᾳ· τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι· ἦτοι τῷ λοξὴν ἴαν πέμποντι· λοξὰ γὰρ μαντεύεται ὁ θεός. ἡ τῷ λοξὴν πορείαν ποιουμένη· ὁ αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶ τῷ ἡλίῳ. ἄλλως· ἐπειδὴ πλάγιος ἐν τῷ ζωδιακῷ φέρεται ὁ αὐτὸς ἥλιος ὢν, κτλ., quae inter ineptias illas quas hic illic sparsit in scholiis Tzetza referenda sunt.<sup>3</sup> atqui alteram hanc doctrinam satis esse antiquam docet Cornut. 226: λοξῶν δὲ καὶ περισκελῶν ὄντων τῶν χρησμῶν οὗς δίδωσι, Λοξίας ὠνόμασται· ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς λοξότητος τῆς πορείας ἣν ποιεῖται διὰ τοῦ ζωδιακοῦ κύκλου. nam Pythagoreum est teste Etym. Mag.<sup>4</sup>

aetate etiam recentiore exortum est schol. Iuntinum ad *Plut.* 39, id quod iam vidit Kuesterus. atque Hemsterhusius, “unde fluxerint,”

<sup>1</sup> atque Ephorum fortasse consuluit Didymus. cf. Strab. 9. 401, Diod. 19. 53.

<sup>2</sup> vid. s. Πύλαι et s. Ἱερομνήμονες.

<sup>3</sup> cf. eundem ad Lyc. 1467. Suid. s. Λοξίας; Eust. 794, 54.

<sup>4</sup> 569. 46. cf. etiam Heraclitum ap. Plut. *Pyth. Or.* 21.

inquit, "aperient Oecumenius, Origenes, alii." at non sentit vir acutus illum verborum lusum, τὰ τῆς μαντείας, ἢ μᾶλλον μανίας, inter primos dixisse Clementem Alexandrinum,<sup>1</sup> qui διήγησαι ἡμῶν, clamavit, καὶ τῆς ἄλλης μαντικῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ μανικῆς, τὰ ἄχρηστα χρηστήρια, κτλ.<sup>2</sup>

### Ἄρης.

Martem deum e Thracia ortum duxisse secundum poetas<sup>3</sup> narrat schol. *Av.* 1369, quae fama adeo in commentarios<sup>4</sup> antiquos late perfusa est, ut auctorem statuere non possimus. Amazones, quarum fuisse reginam Amazonem Martis filiam dicit Pherecydes,<sup>5</sup> Marti ut videtur equos albos immolabant.<sup>6</sup> ac de Scythis quidem similia tradiderat Herodotus (4. 61), quem profecto ante oculos habere noster potuit.

patrem Enyalii secundum aliquos fuisse eum testatur schol. *Pac.* 457: τινὲς δὲ Ἄρεως καὶ Ἐννοῦς τὸν Ἐννάλιον. οἱ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ῥέας. sententiam vero priorem, Enyalium Marte et Bellona natum esse, recentiores modo habuerunt teste *Iliadis* scholiasta (17. 211), alteram autem superiores aetate, ut ait Eustathius (p. 944, 56): οἱ δὲ παλαιοὶ φασὶ καὶ ὅτι Ἐννάλιος Κρόνου καὶ Ῥέας υἱός.

num autem Enyalius ille diversus a Marte esset magna inter philologos Alexandrinos controversia exstabat. nam conferas sis primum schol. *Pac.* 457, ubi sane videtur ipse poeta illos distinguere<sup>7</sup>: πρὸς τοὺς οἰομένους τῶν νεωτέρων τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἄρεα καὶ Ἐννάλιον, κατ'

<sup>1</sup> *Protr.*, p. 11, Potter.

<sup>2</sup> quod vero de nominis origine Apollinis Pythii a putrescendo apud scholiastam fertur id plurimum valebat. cf. *Hymn. Apoll. Pyth.* 193; Macrobius. 1. 17. 50, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς πέψεως (id quod senserat Apollodorus, Strab. 9. 419), sed ἀπὸ τοῦ πύθειν id est σῆκειν, quod numquam sine vi caloris efficitur. cf. Shaks. nostrum 1 *Hen. IV.* ii. 4. 113, Didst thou never see Titan kiss a dish of butter? *Ham.* ii. 2. 182, For if the sun breed maggots in a dead dog, being a god (libri good) kissing carrion.

<sup>3</sup> *Il.* 13. 301; *Od.* 8. 361; Soph. *Ant.* 970; Callim. *h. Del.* 63; Roscher, *Apollon u. Mars*, p. 113 sq.

<sup>4</sup> schol. *Il.* 13. 301; Eust. *Od.* 8. 361; Tzetz. *Lyc.* 937; Cornut. 21, p. 192.

<sup>5</sup> schol. *Ap. Rh.* 2. 990; cf. Schol. *Il.* 24. 804, Townl.

<sup>6</sup> schol. *Lys.* 191; cf. Preller-Robert,<sup>4</sup> i. 343, adn. 5.

<sup>7</sup> contra, Roscher, *Lex.*, p. 1250.

ἐπίθετον. Ἀλκμᾶνα δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτ' αὐτὸν λέγειν, ὅτ' αὐτὸν διαρεῖν.<sup>1</sup> unde scholiastam apparet ipsum Alcmanem non legisse. ac schol. Soph. *Aiac.* 179 eandem comprobare opinionem strenue videtur conari, ut conicias hunc ac nostrum eundem habuisse auctorem quem schol. *Il.* 17. 211 (cf. 20. 69): ὅτι ἐπιθετικῶς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐννοῦς, πολεμικῆς οὐσης, ὁ Ἄρης Ἐννάλιος, ὡς καὶ Ἀρήϊός τις ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἄρεως· οὐχ, ὡς οἱ νεώτεροι, Ἐννοῦς υἱόν, οὐδὲ ὡς Ἀττικοί, διαφέροντα τοῦ Ἄρεως θεόν τινα. Atticos vero, qui Enyalium Martemque discreverint, intellegi vult Sophoclem Aristophanemque.<sup>2</sup>

iam longe post Aristophanem poetam historia pervulgata est quam tradit scholiasta<sup>3</sup> de puero quodam Alectryone Martis amasio, quem, ut de aditu Vulcani moneret, deus ante fores statuisset. constat ipsum Didymum hanc ignorasse<sup>4</sup> fabulam (nam ad eum pertinent sola quae Venetus priore parte scholii servavit), quam repetit Lucianus<sup>5</sup> uberius et ornatus. cum autem eandem fere narrationem servaverit Eustathius,<sup>6</sup> haud perperam concludas primum eam finxisse Apionem Didymi alumnum, quem, utpote rhetorem floridiorem,<sup>7</sup> cum sermonibus elegantibus gauderet, hanc quoque fabellam invenisse non absurdum mihi quidem videtur credere. is igitur, ut opinor, in suis commentariis Homericis primus haec tradidit quibus et nostrum usum esse de hac re constat e schol. *Pac.* 778: σημειοῦνται δὲ ταῦτα ὁ μόχθος (hic est Apio; Suid. s. Ἀπίων) πρὸς τοὺς ἀθετοῦντας τὴν ἐν Ὀδυσσεύϊ Ἄρεως καὶ Ἀφροδίτης μοιχείαν.

### Ἄρτεμις.

de cultu Dianae quae Ἀγροτέρα vocatur haec narrat schol. *Eg.* 660: ἰδίως γὰρ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι σέβουσι καὶ τιμῶσι τὴν Ἀγροτέραν Ἄρτεμιν, κτλ. in extremis quidem nostrum in errorem incidisse, qui boves, non capras dixerit Callimachum Dianae devovisse, vidit iam Meiners,<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *PLG.* iii. 67, frag. 104. Ibycus vero eos non separat; cf. frag. 29, Bergk.

<sup>2</sup> cf. etiam, Xen. *An.* 1. 8. 18; 5. 2. 14; *Hell.* 2. 4. 17; *Cyrop.* 7. 1. 26.

<sup>3</sup> *Av.* 835.

<sup>4</sup> nec cognoverat Servius, *A.* 1. 664; 8. 373.

<sup>5</sup> *Gall.* 3.

<sup>6</sup> *Od.* 1598. 62.

<sup>7</sup> Christ, *Gr. Litt.*, p. 559. de historiis Martis Venerisque bene meritis est K. Tümpel, *Jahrb. f. Philol.*, Suppl. 11, 653 seqq.; cf. p. 717.

<sup>8</sup> pp. 321-322.



quamquam rationem qua peccatum sit is quidem non excogitavit. quonam modo fit ut noster contra Xenophontis et Plutarchi testimonia<sup>1</sup> ita rem rettulerit? ignorabat scilicet quae de illius deae apud Lacedaemonios cultu tradita sunt;<sup>2</sup> nesciebat omnino hircos ei rite immolari posse. contra, ut in Atheniensium modo rebus instructus, intellegebat homines aetate posteriores illud animal victimam haud gratam deae habuisse; igitur cum illam historiam de hircis Dianae immolatis nescio ubi legisset, rationes ad eam rem explicandam ipse commentus est.

quae de Diana Dictynna servantur finxit, ut opinor, Tzetz (Ran. 1356), primum quod Lycophronem citavit,<sup>3</sup> tum quod fabellam de Britomarti, ut mos ei erat, unicam aliasque nusquam repertam<sup>4</sup> tradidit: φασὶ δέ, inquit, ὅτι νύμφη τις Βριτόμαρτις καλουμένη, θηρεύουσα ποτε δικτύοις τισὶ κατὰ τύχην ἐνέπεσε, καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀρτέμιδος βυσθῶσα Δικτύννης Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ἰδρύσατο, quod vero a scholiasta Eur. Hipp. (146, 1130), cuius auctor fuit Callimachus, plane discrepat.<sup>5</sup>

de Diana Brauronia quoniam multa iam scite disputavit Wilamowitz,<sup>6</sup> ac Stein scholium in *Lysistratam* (v. 645) ad illum cultum pertinens maxima cum cura et diligentia nuper edidit, perpauca vero restant quae addam. quae tamen hac de re sentiam breviter exponam. noster enim dicit, auctore Euphorione tragoedo, οἱ δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἰφιγένειαν ἐν Βραυρῶνι φασὶν (γεγενῆσθαι),<sup>7</sup> οὐκ ἐν Αἰλίδι . . . δοκεῖ δὲ Ἀγαμέμνων σφαγιάσαι τὴν Ἰφιγένειαν ἐν Βραυρῶνι, οὐκ ἐν Αἰλίδι. quibus verbis intellegitur tam late de Agamemnone fabulas in Atticam quoque pervasisse ut vix separari possent discernique quae ad Dianam Brauroniā hoc loco cultam attineant atque ad eandem Dianam in Munichia cultam, id quod temere fecit vir summus.<sup>8</sup> neque enim Didymus eas deas discrevit, cum Harpocratio, ἀρκεῖσαι,

<sup>1</sup> Xen. An. 3. 2. 12; Plut. Malign. Herod. 26 ad fin.

<sup>2</sup> Xen. Hell. 4. 2. 20; cf. Rep. Lac. 13. 8.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Tzetz. in Lyc. 1297.

<sup>4</sup> vid. Dar. et Sagl. s. Britomartis, p. 750.

<sup>5</sup> cf. etiam Paus. 2. 30. 3; Diod. 5. 76; [Verg.] Cir. 295.

<sup>6</sup> Hermes xviii. 249.

<sup>7</sup> suppl. vi.

<sup>8</sup> cf. Preller-Robert,<sup>4</sup> i. 312, adn. 2. Strab. 14. 639, εἰτα Πύργου πολέμων, ἱερὸν ἔχον Ἀρτέμιδος Μουνυχίας, ἱδρυμα Ἀγαμέμνονος. fama illius ducis quam late pervenerit indicat etiam proverbium Ἀγαμέμνονεια φρέατα, Zenob. 1. 6.

inquit, . . . τὸ καθιερωθῆναι πρὸ γάμων τὰς παρθένους τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τῇ Μουνυχίᾳ ἢ τῇ Βραυρωνίᾳ. nunc respice Ravennatem, qui cum locis iam laudatis convenit: ἐψηφίσαντο μὴ πρότερον συνοικίεσθαι ἀνδρὶ παρθένον εἰ μὴ ἀρκεύσειεν τῇ θεῇ, unde patet, tempore quolibet antequam nupsissent virgines ritibus quibus ursam quodam modo imitarentur deae se devovere oportuisse. nusquam autem dicitur puellas decem annos natas haec celebrasse,<sup>1</sup> sed aliquando ante conubium. quae si ita sunt, maximo in errore versatur Didymus, qui apud Harp. s. δεκατεύειν hoc dixerit vocabulum idem quod ἀρκεύσαι significare, quia ursas puellae imitarentur decem annos natae.<sup>2</sup> quin tu vide Harp. Μουνυχίων· ὁ δέκατος μὴν παρ' Ἀθηναίοις οὕτω καλεῖται, ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ μηνὶ Ἀρτέμιδι θύεται Μουνυχία. quod si recte haec exposui, eandem esse Dianam Munichiam ac Brauroniā, eosdemque in utriusque honorem ritus celebratos, facile concesseris, decimo mense anni Attici haec sacra Dianae quoque Brauroniae esse facta. verbum igitur δεκατεύειν non respicit puellarum aetatem ursas imitantium, sed ad tempus anni, quo illos ritus faciebant, referendum est, quare et δεκατεύειν et ἀρκεύειν idem significant.

de moris origine et significatione pauca mihi disserenda. neque alienum meo quidem iudicio hanc consuetudinem rudem atque incultam cum simili — mirum quam — apud Barbaros hodie reperta comparare. nam in insulis eois prope terras Sericas eodem fere quo Graeci modo populos ferus ursum venerari audimus.<sup>3</sup> catulum enim ursae a venatoribus captum atque in oppidum delatum mansuefaciunt (cf. schol.: ἀρκτος τις δοθεῖσα εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἡμερώθη), quem nutriunt familiariterque tractant (ποτὲ οὖν μία τις παρθένος ἔπαιξε πρὸς αὐτῇ). postea autem, cum tempus iam adest, multis

<sup>1</sup> neque hercle poeta huius rei est auctor, nam cum *Lys.* 641 dicit: εἴτ' ἀλετριεῖ ἢ δεκέτις οὖσα τάρχηγέτι· καὶ ἔχουσα τὸν κροκωτὸν ἀρκτος ἢ Βραυρωνίαις, illo καὶ τ' docet posteriore demum tempore ursas eas fuisse quam molebant τῇ ἀρχηγέτι; haec autem non Diana, ut ait noster, sed Minerva est. nam Dianam ἀρχηγέτιν apud Atticos nusquam reperies, quamquam Ephesi erutus est titulus qui hoc nomen memorat; Wood, *Inscr. in Gr. Theatres*, i. col. 1, 17; Dar. et Sagl., p. 148.

<sup>2</sup> Didymi igitur est schol. *Lys.* 641, quod illud ἀρχηγέτι de Diana dictum esse intellegit. ac Didymus quidem librum περὶ τοῦ δεκατεύσαι totum scripsit; M. Schmidt, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> vid. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii. 99 sq.

salutationibus et precationibus dum mulieres puellaeque tamquam piantes circa ludunt et saltant, viri occidunt (λυπηθεῖς ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτῆς ἀνέειλε τὴν ἄρκτον. ἡ δὲ Ἄρτεμις ἐκέλευσε παρθένον πᾶσαν μιμήσασθαι τὴν ἄρκτον πρὸ τοῦ γάμου, κτλ.).<sup>1</sup> denique observandum est, cum apud Argivos cerva, non ursam, Dianae sacra esset,<sup>2</sup> cervamque Iphigeniae deam substituisse plerique tradidissent, Atticos tamen Euphorionem ac Pleuronium ursam pro cerva illi subpositam esse dixisse, quippe qui ursam velut animal deae sanctum habebant. quoniam praeterea de hac re disseruit Phanodemus,<sup>3</sup> haud dubium est quin Apollodorus, cui scholium de Diana Brauronia adsignavit Stein,<sup>4</sup> ac Didymus auctores habuerit Atthidographos.

historicos utique Hellenicum et Phanodemum videmus de Diana Colaenide atque Amarynthia laudatos a schol. *An.* 873: φησὶ δὲ Ἑλλάνικος (frag. 79) Κόλαινον Ἑρμοῦ ἀπόγονον ἐκ ματιείου ἱερὸν ἰδρυσασθαι Κολαινίδος Ἀρτέμιδος, καὶ Φανόδημος (frag. 2) ἐν τῇ δ'. Εὐφρόνιος δὲ φησιν ὅτι ἐν Ἀμαρύνθῃ ἡ Κολαινίς, διὰ τὸ τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα θύσαι αὐτῇ ἐκεῖ κριὸν κόλον . . . τοῦτο δὲ μήποτε ἐσχεδιάσται. οἱ γὰρ Μυρρινούσιοι Κολαινίδα ἐπονομάζουσι τὴν Ἄρτεμιν, ὥσπερ Πειραιεῖς τὴν Μουνυχίαν, Φιλαῖδαι δὲ τὴν Βραυρωνίαν. hoc quidem scholium a Didymo conscriptum est, id quod docet illud μήποτε, h.e. fortasse.<sup>5</sup> sed Pausanias adeo, ut videtur, contra Euphronium se declarat, ut 1. 31. 4 affirmet: Ἀθμονεῖς δέ, inquit, τιμῶσιν Ἀμαρυσίαν Ἄρτεμιν, non autem illam Κολαινίδα. item 1. 31. 5: ἔστιν Ἀμάρυνθος ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ . . . ταύτῃ μὲν γενέσθαι τὸ ὄνομα ἐπὶ τούτῃ παρὰ Ἀθμονεῦσιν ἡγοῦμαι, τὴν δὲ ἐν Μυρρινούντι Κολαινίδα ἀπὸ Κολαινοῦ καλεῖσθαι. quod tamen noster dicere volebat clarum est: in oppido Amaryntho Euboico esse Dianam Colaenida, cuius cultum instituisset Colaenus Mercurii filius, teste Hellenico, sed in Athmonia demo Attico, quo religio illius deae postea esse videtur<sup>6</sup> translata, Dianam Amarysiam coli, nomine deae ex oppido sumpto; deinde in demo Myrrhinunte Colaenidem eandem appellari, itaque nomen a Euboicis suae deae datum

<sup>1</sup> de eadem re similia fere ap. Bekk. *An.* 1. 444, quo apparet ursos antiquitus in Attica fuisse multos. cf. Eust. 331. 26; Suid. Ἐμβαρὸς εἰμι.

<sup>2</sup> an "totem" liceat vocare? schol. Soph. *Electr.* 6.

<sup>3</sup> frag. 11, *E. M.* 747. 57. cf. Tzetz. *Lyc.* 683.

<sup>4</sup> p. xii.

<sup>5</sup> M. Schmidt, p. 212.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Preller-Robert, *i.* 311, adn. 4.

in Attica quoque servari. res autem satis est obscura, quam etiam interpretes antiqui se ipsi negarent intellegere.<sup>1</sup> de Diana Amynthia licet disputaverit Apollodorus,<sup>2</sup> non audeo idcirco affirmare Euphronium illum habuisse auctorem.

mentionem tantummodo facit schol. *Eg.* 84, Dianae quae in Magnesia Λευκοφρυνή vocabatur, qui de Themistocle locutus, βούλοιο, inquit, καὶ ἱερουργῆσαι τῇ Λευκόφρυνι (ita) Ἀρτέμιδι. quo pacto Dindorfius Suidam neglexerit hic quidem licet perspicere. nam cum Venetus Λευκοφρύνιδι, Θ autem Λευκοφρυνίδι exhibeat, ille grammaticus formam Λευκοφρύνιν servavit, vix illam quidem rectam, sed cui nihilominus veterem veramque subesse suspicemur. nam cum Strabonem<sup>3</sup> de Tenedo disserentem illo Λευκόφρυνι usum esse videamus, sed contra de Magnesia<sup>4</sup> forma a titulis<sup>5</sup> firmata Λευκοφρυνή, hanc denique, illo Suidae Λευκοφρύνιν comparato, apud nostrum restituendam censeo.

iam vidimus<sup>6</sup> Apollodorum omnia quae de Diana Brauronia adferuntur auctorem nobis praestitisse. tum vide Suid. s. ταυροπόλον· τὴν Ἀρτεμιν, ὅτι ὡς ταῦρος περίεσι πάντα, ὡς Ἀπολλόδωρος.<sup>7</sup> eiusdem igitur sententiam profert idem s. ταυροπόλα (cf. schol. Soph. *Al.* 172), ἣ ὅτι ἡ αὐτὴ ἐστὶ τῇ σελήνῃ<sup>8</sup> καὶ ἐποχεῖται ταύροις· ἦν καὶ ταυρωπὸν ὀνομάζουσιν. hinc colligas et scholiastam (*Lys.* 443) illius doctrinam servare, cum ad verba νῆ τὴν Φωσφόρον, τὴν Ἀρτεμιν, inquit, οὕτως ἐκάλουν, ἐπεὶ δαδούχος. ἡ αὐτὴ γὰρ τῇ Ἑκάτῃ. ἡ ἐπεὶ καὶ τῇ σελήνῃ ἡ αὐτὴ. ac scholiastam Theocriti quoque ex eodem fonte hausisse haec indicant ad *Idyll.* 2. 12 : καὶ νῦν Ἀρτεμις καλεῖται καὶ φύλαξ καὶ δαδούχος καὶ Φωσφόρος. laudat etiam poetae fabulam quae Δαιταλεῖς ferebatur (frag. 204 K).

<sup>1</sup> Paus. l.c.

<sup>2</sup> ap. Strab. 10. 448, Demetrii Scepsii librum secutus qui Τρωικὸς διάκοσμος inscribatur. vid. Niesium in *Mus. Rhén.* 32. 267.

<sup>3</sup> 13. 604.

<sup>4</sup> 14. 647.

<sup>5</sup> *CIG.* 2914, 3137 (Ditt. *Sylloge*, 171). post in Λευκοφρυνή contractum est; Paus. 1. 26. 4, 3. 18. 9; schol. Clem. *Protr.*, p. 786.

<sup>6</sup> p. 108.

<sup>7</sup> "mira etymologia," Heynius ad Apollod., p. 402.

<sup>8</sup> hanc saltem opinionem habuisse Apollodorum veri simile esse iam monui, pp. 100, 101.

ut ad *Lys.* 644,<sup>1</sup> sic ad *Lys.* 1299–1300, noster confusus incertusque est, qui dicit χαλκιοίκον Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ἐν Δανεδαίμονι. atqui unusquisque Dianam scit numquam appellatam esse χαλκιοίκον.

de Diana Ephesia haec sola in Rav. servantur (*Nub.* 599): μετὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα εὐθὺς τὴν Ἀρτεμιν, ἧς ἱερὸν ἢ Ἐφεσος.<sup>2</sup> addit autem schol. Iunt.: πάγχρυσον δὲ οἶκον λέγει, τὸν πολυτελέστατον ναόν· ὅς ἦν εἰς τῶν θαυμάτων. verbum temporis praeteriti ἦν indicat, tum cum haec sunt scripta, templum illud celeberrimum Ephesi non iam exstitisse. igitur post annum CCLX nostrae aetatis, quo anno templum demoliti sunt Gothi,<sup>3</sup> haec esse scripta necesse est. quoniam autem Philo Byzantius, qui de septem mundi miraculis auctor medio aevo eminentissimus fuit, libellum περὶ ἑπτὰ θαυμάτων ineunte saeculo sexto scripsit,<sup>4</sup> ex aetate etiam posteriore originem duxit scholium Iuntinum.<sup>5</sup>

### Ἀθηνᾶ.

Minervae e Iovis capite ortae fabulam, cuius primordia iam apud Hesiodum<sup>6</sup> exstare constat, tangit modo schol. *Nub.* 989, τριτογενεῖς . . . τριτὴ γὰρ ἡ κεφαλὴ παρ' Αἰολεῦσιν. ἐγεννήθη δὲ Ἀθηνᾶ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ Διός. scholium vero hoc, quod in libris Rav. et Ven. deest, cum id referat quod nemo alius nisi Tzetza (ad *Lyc.* 519) dixit, τριτὴ verbum fuisse Aeolicum, ab illo sine ulla controversia confectum est. quocirca is, quem Hesiodi studiosum fuisse notum est, magis hunc quam poetas lyricos secutus est, qui verba epici (*Theog.* 924) αὐτὸς δ' ἐκ κεφαλῆς γλαυκώπιδα Τριτογένειαν<sup>7</sup> recordatus esse videatur, cum Ps.-Apollodorus contra (13. 6) illo ἐκ κορυφῆς Pindarico usus sit. ac notandum est Tetzam τριτὴ Aeolicum fuisse affirmantem auctorum suorum male meminisse, cum Nican-

<sup>1</sup> vid. p. 107, adn. 1.

<sup>2</sup> vid. Martin.

<sup>3</sup> Zosim. 1. 26; Eutrop. 9. 8; Guhl, *Ephesus*, p. 169.

<sup>4</sup> Rohden, *de mundi mirac.*, 1875.

<sup>5</sup> cf. schol. in cod. Taurin. ap. Zacherum, p. 646; Strab. 14, p. 656.

<sup>6</sup> *Theog.* 886, 924; cf. Stesichorum ap. schol. Ap. Rh. 4. 1310; h. Hom. 28; Pind. O. 7. 34–38.

<sup>7</sup> Galenus quidem (*Hippocr. et Plat.* iii., p. 350 K) legerat γαῖαν Ἀθήνην.

der Colophonius<sup>1</sup> illud Athamanum fuisse populi Epirotici dixisset.<sup>2</sup>

meliora, etiam si pauca, tradit cod. Ven. ad *Eg.* 1189 ut verbum ἐνετριώνωσεν explicetur: ἢ ὡς ἀπὸ Τρίτωνος ποταμοῦ Λιβύης, παρ' ᾧ ἐτέχθη ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ. quod si comparas schol. Ap. Rh. 1. 109,<sup>3</sup> quem Dionysii librum ante oculos habuisse supra monui,<sup>4</sup> haud dubie hic quoque levia habemus indicia quibus Didymum copiis Dionysii nisum esse ostendamus: Τρίτωνες τρεῖς, Βοιωτίας, Θεσσαλίας, Λιβύης. ἐν δὲ τῷ κατὰ Λιβύην ἐτέχθη ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ. Tritonem etiam fluvium, non lacum,<sup>5</sup> appellant Apollon. Rhod., schol. *Il.*, Suid., Phot., Hesych.,<sup>6</sup> quibuscum convenit noster.

atqui ea prorsus ad diversum auctorem referenda sunt quae de Minervae et Neptuni certamine, utrius urbs Atheniensium futura esset, scholia tradunt *Eg.* 562, *Ecl.* 473; cf. *Nub.* 587: ἀποτυχόντος, φασί, Ποσειδῶνος τῆς χώρας τὸ κακῶς βουλευέσθαι Ἀθηναίους ἥσκητο. τὴν δὲ Ἀθηνᾶν παρασχέιν δωρεὰν τὸ κακῶς βουλευθὲν ἀποκλῖναι καλῶς. καὶ ἦν τοῦτο λεγόμενον ἐπιχώριον. sed Neptunum hoc certamine superatum atque iratum Athenienses non imprudentia insipientiaque mentibus inmissa castigasse referunt fabularum scriptores, sed campum Thriasium aquis effusus submersisse.<sup>7</sup> praeterea comparet ex hoc scholio, Suida, Athenaeo,<sup>8</sup> Didymum in suum librum de proverbiiis<sup>9</sup> famam hanc apud Atticos volgarem redegisse.

de Academia olivisque Minervae sacris dixit noster (*Nub.* 1005): ἀπὸ Ἑκαδήμου τινός, καταλείψαντος τὴν κτῆσιν ἑαυτοῦ πρὸς ἐπισκευὴν τοῦ τόπου. περὶ αὐτὸν δ' ἦσαν αἱ ὄντως ἱερὰ ἐλαῖαι τῆς θεοῦ αἱ καλοῦνται μορφαί. ἐξ ὧν τὸ ἔλαιον τῶν Παναθηναίων. his quidem in Ven. et Rav. non iam servatis convenit Suid. s. Ἀκαδήμεια.<sup>10</sup> quod vero refertur,

<sup>1</sup> Hesych. s. Τριτώ (cf. Suid. s. Τριτογενής, Bekk.).

<sup>2</sup> et alii alia: verbum Atticum est secundum Cornut. 2, ad fin.; cf. codd. Suid. l.c. Creticum, Eust. 504, 27.

<sup>3</sup> cf. 4. 1310.

<sup>4</sup> Bethe, *Quaestiones Diodorae*, p. 45. vid. supra, pp. 100, 101.

<sup>5</sup> Suid. s. Τριτώνης.

<sup>6</sup> Ap. Rh. 4. 1310; schol. *Il.* 4. 515, 8. 391; Lexx. s. Τριτογενής, E. M. 767. 44.

<sup>7</sup> Ps.-Apollod. 3. 14. 1; Hygin. fab. 164.

<sup>8</sup> Suid. s. Ἀθηναίων δυσβουλία; Athen. 10, p. 425 B.

<sup>9</sup> M. Schmidt, p. 13; Christ, p. 569.

<sup>10</sup> cf. L. Diog. 3. 7, ubi Eupolis et Timaeus laudantur; Steph. B. s. Ἑκαδήμεια.

oleum quod arbores in luco Academia sacrae ferrent eis donatum esse qui victoriam Panathenaicis reportassent, id est Aristotelis.<sup>1</sup> quisnam autem hunc legerat? non mythographus, ut Apollodorus,<sup>2</sup> cum potius grammaticus aliquis, sicut Aristophanes (schol. *Nub.* 1007) Byzantius, intellegi possit. sed ipsa de re scholiastae Sophoclis (*O. C.* 701) disputanti auctorem liquet fuisse Istrum, et quoniam Plutarchus (*Thes.* 32) a nostro haud dissentit, is autem, ut monuit G. Gilbert,<sup>3</sup> plerumque in vita Thesei eundem est secutus Istrum, noster quoque quin Istro Dicaearchum Philochorum aliosque Atthiographos secuto haec debeat nihil dubium.

magni vero est momenti scholium in *Lys.* 447, de Minerva Taurobolo vel Tauropolo: ἡ τὴν Ταυροπόλον· οὕτω τὴν Ἀρτεμιν ἐκάλουν . . . ἔστι δ' ὅτε καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν οὕτω καλοῦσιν, ὡς Ξενομήδης ἱστορεῖ (*FHG.* ii. 43). Xenomedes hic, ut ait Dionysius Halicarnassius,<sup>4</sup> Chius historicus res gestas, mores, opiniones, fabulas ita narrabat ut omnia cuique sua populo distingueret neque unquam contaminaret. hunc igitur utpote insulas Aegaeas singillatim describentem auctorem fabulae quam tradidit Suidas s. Ταυροπόλον fuisse agnosces<sup>5</sup>: καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ δὲ Ταυροβόλος ἐν Ἀνδρῶ. ὁ γὰρ Ἄνιος δοὺς ταῦτον τοῖς Ἀτρεΐδαις ἐκέλευσεν, ὅπου ἂν ἐκ τῆς νεῶς ἄλλῃται, ἰδρύσασθαι Ἀθηνᾶν, καὶ οὕτως εὐπλοήσειν. ὁ δὲ ἐν Ἀνδρῶ ἐξήλατο. neque equidem dubito quin Suidas etiam scholiastae instar inter scholia nostra huc inferendus sit.

postremo mihi disputandum est de schol. *Eg.* 566<sup>6</sup> quod, licet fabulam tradiderit nullam, tamen medicina valde eget:

I. ἰδίᾳ παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις πέπλος τὸ ἄρμενον τῆς Παναθηναϊκῆς νεῶς, ἣν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι κατασκευάζουσι τῇ θεῷ διὰ τετραετηρίδος. ἥς καὶ τὴν πομπὴν ἀπὸ Κεραμεικοῦ ποιοῦσι μέχρι τοῦ Ἐλευσινίου.

II. πέπλον δὲ καλοῦσι τὸ ἄρμενον διὰ τὸ ἀραιὸν αὐτὸ εἶναι.

III. ἄλλως. οὐ ἐγγράπτο Ἐγκέλαδος, ὃν ἀνέειλεν ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ. ἣν δὲ εἰς τῶν γιγάντων. ἐπεσκευάζετο οὖν ὁ πέπλος καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ ἐπομπεύετο ἐν τοῖς Παναθηναίοις.

IV. ἄλλως. νικῆσαντες πέπλον ἐποίησαν τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ ἐνέθεντο τοὺς ἀρίστους ἐν αὐτῷ.

<sup>1</sup> schol. Soph. *O. C.* 701; *Rep. Ath.* 60. 1.

<sup>2</sup> schol. *O. C.* 56.

<sup>3</sup> *Philol.* 33. 46.

<sup>4</sup> *Thuc. iudic.*, vol. vi, p. 818, Reiske.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Phot. s.v.; Hesych. Ταυροπόλαι.

<sup>6</sup> Suid. s. Πέπλος.

scatent haec vitiis quorum partem quidem sanare licet. quo magis perspicue dissererem scholium divisi in partes quattuor. primum videndum est verbum *τετραετηρίδος* inferiore usitatum aetate<sup>1</sup> de feriis quinquennialibus secundum antiquam rationem computandi et numerandi nequaquam dici potuisse. rectius habet schol. *Pac.* 418: τῇ δὲ Ἀθηνῇ ἡγοῦτο διὰ πέντε ἐτῶν, κτλ. tum altera in parte scholii quod fertur, peplum sive velum sic appellari quod sit *δραιόν*, neque causa neque ratio est. atque ne *δραιόν* quidem satis certum, cum Venetus *δραιούν*, Suidas *δρεούν* voces nihili habeant. quod si illud *δρεούν* conferatur cum schol. Eur. *Hec.* 466–471, qui de his rebus amplissime disserit, facile perspicietur quid sub nostri verbis lateat. sic igitur scribo alteram partem scholii: *πέπλον δὲ καλοῦσι τὸ ἄρμενον τοῦτο,*<sup>2</sup> *ᾧ δὲ διὰ πενταετηρίδος ἐν τοῖς Παναθηναίοις ἀνιέρου.*<sup>3</sup>

denique extremas partes non tam corruptas esse quam indocte scriptas apparet, primum quod consentaneum est, peplum quotannis non contexti solitum esse,<sup>4</sup> deinde quod in eo Minervae cum gigantibus certationem temporibus saltem Aristophaneis<sup>5</sup> depictam esse testatur Strattis ap. schol. Eur. *Hec.* 468; cf. nostrum ad *Av.* 827.

### Ἡφαιστος.

Quoniam de Vulcani apud Graecos cultu parum certiores facti sumus a scriptoribus antiquioribus, quicquid ad deum cognoscendum eiusque religionem intellegendam contulit scholiasta grato profecto animo audiendum est. ac munus quidem et officium ignis, et praesertim ignis in foco tuendi, notatur a schol. *Av.* 436 (= Suid. s. *ἐπιστάτης*), ubi verbum *ἐπιστάτης* in Rav. sic definitur: *ἐπιστάτης*

<sup>1</sup> Steph. *Thes.* vii. 2065.

<sup>2</sup> supplevi e Suida.

<sup>3</sup> supplevi schol. Eur. conlato.

<sup>4</sup> verba κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ap. Diod. 20. 46, uncis inclusit Dindorf. cf. Wesseling ad loc.; Ditt. *Syll.* 380; Harp. s. *πέπλος*; schol. Eur. *Hec.* 468.

<sup>5</sup> vide Diels *Mus. Rhén.* 30. 136 de *Eq.* 1180. [Verg.] Cir. 20, de Minervae victoria solius loquitur; contra, Plut. *Demetr.* 12. Atque hodie vero in Lesbo insula mulieres mappam imagine Virginis Sanctae acu pictam in fano archangeli Michaelis quod dicitur dedicant. Wood, *Travels and Discoveries*, i. 109; Bernh. Schmidt, *Volksleben d. Neugriechen*, p. 69.



δέ, χαλκοῦς τρίπους χυτρόποδος ἐκτελῶν χρεῖαν. οἱ δὲ πῆλινον Ἡφαίστον πρὸς ταῖς ἐστίαις ἱδρυμένον, ὡς ἔφερον τοῦ πυρός. quarum priorem interpretationem e cod. Ven. videmus esse Callistrati, cuius sententiam hodie usurparunt viri doctissimi.<sup>1</sup> minime tamen eo iure testimonium infirmatur talia simulacra prope focos exstrui solita esse. et Vulcano ut deo qui igni praesideret primum πέλανον vel libum, quod illi ferebatur πρόθυμα in initio sacrificii, in ignem iniectum arae consecrabant (schol. *Plut.* 661).

ad *Lys.* 299 haec tradit noster: Λήμιον τὸ πῦρ· ἀντὶ τοῦ πάνυ γενναῖον. ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν Λημιῶν γυναικῶν, πορνῶν οὐσῶν. ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν καμίνων τοῦ Ἡφαίστου. mulieres Lemnias in primis libidinosas fuisse ab alio usquam auctore traditum ego non inveni. quin notum certe est quo modo Veneris numine palam contemptui habito et violato suos viros interfecerint.<sup>2</sup> qua de re haud dubie scholiasta cogitavit, cum ad versum 298 scripsit: παρὰ τὴν παροιμίαν, Λήμιον κακόν, παρὰ τὰς Λημιάδας γυναικας, quae quidem e Didymi libro de proverbiis deprompta sunt.<sup>3</sup> ad hoc scelus expiandum Hellanicus scripsit mulieres in Veneris honorem sacrificium solemne quotannis statutum celebrasse.<sup>4</sup> sane fieri potest ut in Lemno, sicut in Cypro, dum haec fiebant sacra, mulieres libidini sese dederint, ut inde ansam verbis scholiastae adhibuerint. sed credere malim Lemnias eum mulieres cum Lesbiis confudisse. hae quidem, ut notum est, ut flagitiosae cum Sappho eiusque puellis a comicis inridentur atque increpantur.

denique quod officinas atque furnum Vulcani commemorat scholiasta, recte ille quidem,<sup>5</sup> sed aliis tamen verbis ac schol. Ap. Rh. et schol. Soph. loquitur. ille<sup>6</sup> enim ἱερά γάρ, inquit, Ἡφαίστου ἡ Λήμνος, hic<sup>7</sup> autem ἐν γὰρ τῇ Λήμνῃ ἐργαστήριον τοῦ Ἡφαίστου, ἐνθα καὶ κρατῆρες πυρός εἰσιν. quocirca scholium Aristophanis non ad Didymum, sed ad scriptorem cum aetate tum scientia inferiorem referimus.

<sup>1</sup> vid. Kock ad loc.; Roberts, *Gr. Epigraphy*, pp. 78, 336.

<sup>2</sup> Ps.-Apollod. 1. 19. 17: αἱ Λημνῖαι τὴν Ἀφροδίτην οὐκ ἐτίμων. historiam apud Apollod. traditam narrat etiam schol. Ap. Rh. 1. 609 (cf. ipsum poetam, 614 sq.), schol. Eur. *Hec.* 887.

<sup>3</sup> schol. Eur. *Hec.* 887.

<sup>4</sup> Tzetz. *Lyc.* 227.

<sup>5</sup> hodie etiam oppidum Lemni est Kaminia (Roberts, *Epigraphy*, p. 311, adn. 2).

<sup>6</sup> schol. Ap. Rh. 1. 85.

<sup>7</sup> schol. Soph. *Phil.* 800, cf. 986; Eust. 1598. 43.

cursus noctu cum facibus habitos esse in Vulcani, sicut in Promethei ac Minervae honorem, illosque Ἡφαίστεια nominari, scholiasta tradit (*Ran.* 131, 1087), libro ut videtur usus Polemonis περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς Προπυλαίοις πινάκων.<sup>1</sup>

## Ἑρμῆς.

Mercurii cognomina servat scholiasta multa, partim a poeta collata partim etiam ex ipsius memoria ac scientia prompta. memoratur enim Mercurius ἀγοραῖος (*Eq.* 297, *Plut.* 1185), διάκονος (*Plut.* 1134, 1153, cf. 1170), δόλιος (*Thesm.* 1202, *Ran.* 1144, *Plut.* 1153), ἐμπολαῖος (*Ach.* 816, *Plut.* 1153, 1155), ἐναγώνιος (*Plut.* 1153, 1161), ἐφριούνιος (*Ran.* 1144), ἡγεμόνιος (*Plut.* 1153), καταβάτης (*Pac.* 650), κερδῶς (*Plut.* 1153), στροφαῖος (*Plut.* 1153), χθόνιος (*Ach.* 1076, *Ran.* 218, 1126). quae vero de hoc deo adferuntur magis ad ritum, caerimonias, cultum quam ad res fabulares pertinent, eademque ad litteratos et grammaticos, non ad fabularum scriptores revocanda. nam de Mercurio qui στροφαῖος dicitur explicationem haud dubie ex eodem quo Eustathius fonte, id est e Lexico rhetorico, noster duxit. cf. enim schol. *Plut.* 1153 cum Eust. 1353. 8 seqq.

atque alias certum est idem Lexicon usui fuisse scholiastae de sortibus quae dicebantur Mercurii disputanti; cf. enim *Pac.* 364 (Ven.), οἱ γὰρ κληροὶ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ ἱεροὶ δοκοῦσιν εἶναι, ὅθεν καὶ τὸν πρῶτον κληρούμενον Ἑρμῆν φασὶ δεῖν καλεῖν, cum Hesych. Suid. Phot. s. κληρος Ἑρμοῦ, Phot. s. Ἑρμοῦ κληρος, Eustath. 675. 55. item eodem tendunt quae de nomine dei qui νόμος appellatur cum greges et pecudes quasi pastor tueatur, explicata reperimus:

Schol. *Thesm.* 977.

Eust. 1053. 55 (cf. 1766. 1).

Ἑρμῆν τε νόμον· ἔφορος γὰρ  
τῶν θρεμμάτων ὁ θεός.

ὁ τῶν μήλων ἦτοι τῶν θρεμμά-  
των ἐπιστάτῶν ὡς νόμος.

sed de Mercurio Ἑναγωνίῃ eadem fere memorat noster quae in scholiis Pindaricis, ut Didymi scilicet esse videantur, reperta sunt:

---

<sup>1</sup> Harp. s. Δαμπός.

Schol. *Plut.* 1161, R.V.P.

μοῖραν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν ἔχει  
ὁ Ἑρμῆς.

Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 10. 96.

ἐπεὶ οἱ . . . Διόσκουροι σὺν τῷ  
Ἑρμῇ καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ τὴν τῶν ἀγῶνων  
μοῖραν τῆς εὐτυχίας διέκουσι καὶ  
διοικοῦσιν.

Ibid. codd. L.B.

ἐπιστάτης τῶν ἀγῶνων καὶ πανη-  
γύρων.

Schol. *Pyth.* 2. 18 = *Isth.* 1. 85.

ἐναγώνιος δὲ ὁ Ἑρμῆς ὡς τῶν  
ἀγῶνων προστάτης.

nunc aspice sis scholium quod de Mercurio Cyllenio haec fert (*Ran.* 1266): Ἑρμᾶν μὲν πρόγονον· ἐκ τῶν Αἰσχύλου Ψυχαγωγῶν (Frag. 273 N.). τὸ δὲ “Ἑρμᾶν (ita) μὲν τίομεν” λέγουσιν οἱ Ἀρκαδες διὰ ταῦτα· ἐν τῇ Κυλλήνῃ, ἣ ἐστὶν ὄρος Ἀρκαδίας, ἐτιμᾶτο ὁ Ἑρμῆς. διὰ γοῦν τὴν ἐξ ἀμνημονεύτων χρόνων τιμὴν ὡς πρόγονος τούτοις ἰδοῦκε. quod si huc adponis schol. Pind. *O.* 6. 129: Κυλλήνῃ ὄρος Ἀρκαδίας, ἱερὸν Ἑρμοῦ. φησὶ δὲ ὅτι, εἰ δὴ ἀληθῶς οἱ τοῦ Ἀγῆσιου κατὰ μητέρα πρόγονοι τὴν Κυλλήνην κατοικοῦντες τὸ τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ὄρος, ἐτίμησαν διὰ δώρων καὶ θυσιῶν πολλῶν πολλάκις τὸν κήρυκα τῶν θεῶν τὸν Ἑρμῆν, κτλ., cognata haec esse manifestum erit. cum autem verba poetae (*Ran.* 1266) scholiastaeque ibidem (λίμαν δὲ λέγει τὴν Στυμφαλίδα) cum schol. Pind. *O.* 6. 144 contulerimus Στύμφηλος ὑπόκειται τῇ Κυλλήνῃ, ἐστὶ δὲ τῆς Ἀρκαδίας . . . Φιλοστέφανος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Κυλλήνης φησὶ Κυλλήνην καὶ Ἑλίκην θρέψαι [τὸν Ἑρμῆν], Didymum huius regionis fabularumque scientiam Philostephano<sup>1</sup> Cyrenensi debere viderimus.

at multo profecto remotiores quam illud Lexicon rhetoricum scholiastae fontes in vocabulis huius dei propriis interpretandis sunt quaerendi, cum de his rebus non modo Symmachi et Didymi (*Av.* 1705) sed etiam Callistrati (*Plut.* 1110) atque Aristarchi (*Ran.* 1144) sententias laudari videmus, ut non sit dubium quin, quae ad verba saltem exponenda pertinent, ea ad Aristarchum, immo potius ad Aristophanem ipsum revocanda sint.<sup>2</sup>

quibus de fontibus iam expositis, ad argumentum scholiastae veniam. de Mercurio in foro condito habet Ven. ad *Eg.* 297: ἐν

<sup>1</sup> *FHG.* iii. 30. cf. etiam nostrum ad *Av.* 1421 et schol. Pind. *O.* 7. 153.

<sup>2</sup> Susemihl, i. 438, adn. 33; cf. etiam 429.

μέση γὰρ τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἰδρυταὶ Ἑρμοῦ ἀγοραίου ἄγαλμα, quod confirmant et alii et Pausanias (1. 15. 1), cuius fuit auctor haud dubie Philochorus, si quidem idoneus est testis Hesychius s. ἀγοραῖος Ἑρμῆς· ἀφιδρυτο Κέβριδος (?) ἄρξαντος, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ Φιλόχορος ἐν τρίτῳ. neque est meo quidem iudicio<sup>1</sup> cur hanc effigiem eam fuisse negemus quam post victoriam Salaminiam dicasse Athenienses testatur Lucianus.<sup>2</sup> sed quoniam eodem fere tempore Panis cultus ex Arcadia Athenas translatus institutus est, ut ait Herodotus,<sup>3</sup> is autem filius Mercurii a nonnullis habebatur,<sup>4</sup> ergo facere equidem non possum quin tum cum Athenienses Pana illum deum Arcadium colere inciperent patrem quoque credam Mercurium simul honore praecipuo eximioque haberi coeptum esse ob egregiam victoriam de Persis modo partam. et cum praesertim huic deo, quem Graeci appellabant ἡγεμόνιον, primo vere imperatores sacrificasse doceant inscriptiones,<sup>5</sup> eundem puto Mercurium fuisse Ἑγεμόνιον atque Ἀγοραῖον, et hunc praeterea nostrum dicere voluisse ad *Plut.* 1159 affirmantem: κατὰ χρησμόν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἡγεμόνιον Ἑρμῆν ἰδρύσαντο. neque est causa, licet Mercurium illum oraculi monitu ab Atheniensibus statutum nemo auctor sit,<sup>6</sup> cur de scholiastae veritate haereamus. saepissime enim scriptores antiqui deorum cultus oraculi iussu institutos memoraverunt.<sup>7</sup>

quae de Argo Ius custode invenimus necesse est a poetis post Homerum florentibus fluxerint, atque ipse id monstrat scholiasta *Ecccl.* 80, *Av.* 1203, ubi verba comici ex Sophoclis<sup>8</sup> *Inacho* ducta esse monet. atqui aetate demum multo recentiore, quoad invenire potui,<sup>9</sup> historia exorta est illa de Argo in pavonem mutato; nam primus, ut videtur, hoc narrat Moschus.<sup>10</sup> qua re aliquantum habet

<sup>1</sup> cf. Wilam. *Herm.* xxi. 600, adn. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Jupp. Trag.* 33.

<sup>3</sup> 6. 105.

<sup>4</sup> Herod. 2. 145; Cic. *N. D.* 3. 22. 56; schol. Theocr. *Syring.*

<sup>5</sup> *CIA.* iii. 197; Ditt. *Syll.* 335, 374; Boeckh. *Staatshaushalt.* ii. 116.

<sup>6</sup> vid. Hemsterh. ad loc.

<sup>7</sup> haec exempla congesi: schol. *Av.* 873; *Ach.* 961; *Plut.* 431; Thuc. 3. 104; Diod. 4. 80, 5. 3; schol. *Il.* 22. 29; Tzetz. *Lyc.* 208, 663; cf. Ditt. *Syll.* 13 et adn. 2; *Πυθόχρηστος*, schol. *Nub.* 2, Tzetz. *Lyc.* 1208, Ditt. 370.

<sup>8</sup> quem inspexit etiam auctor [*Apd.*] *Bibl.* 2. 1. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Rosch. *Lex.*, p. 538.

<sup>10</sup> 2. 55; cf. Nonn. *Dionys.* 12. 70, Propert. 1. 3. 20; Ovid. *M.* 1. 625.

momenti schol. *Av.* 102 : ὁ μῦθος δὲ λέγει τὸν Ἄργον εἰς ταῦτα μεταβελῆσθαι. verbum illud ὁ μῦθος in scholiis nostris vix alibi repertum saepissime occurrit apud recentiores.<sup>1</sup> cum autem adeo eisdem fere quibus schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 1114 verbis utitur noster, veri simile est utrumque auctorem habuisse eundem. fabulae vero de pavone, de qua et Eustathius et Ps.-Apollodorus tacent, ansam probabile est dedisse illud Euripideum στικτοῖς πανόπτην ὄμμασιν δεδορκότα (*Phoen.* 1115). Dionysius utique historicus (apud schol. *Phoen.* l.c.) contra Pherecydem eumque qui Διγίμον scripsit affirmarat κύκλῳ τὸ σῶμα ὅλον ὠμματῶσθαι.

Ἑστία.

scholio *Vesp.* 846 omnium longe amplissime explicantur illa verba ἀφ' Ἑστίας ἀρχόμενος, de quibus iam docte disputavit Preunerus.<sup>2</sup> et cum id notabile animadverteris, quod Sophocles Platoque laudantur, quod brevius apud Zenobium<sup>3</sup> eadem traduntur, denique quod similia a schol. Plat. *Euthyd.* 3 A atque Eustathio (1579. 43) repetuntur, haud perperam conligas omnia Didymi industriae ut proverbiorum scriptoris haec originem debere. is vero fabulam hanc ab Aristocrito historico<sup>4</sup> uspiam repertam intulit: μῦθον δὲ συνέθηκεν Ἀριστόκριτος οὕτως ἔχοντα. μετὰ γὰρ τὸ καταλυθῆναι τὴν τῶν Τιτάνων ἀρχήν, τὸν Δία δεξάμενον τὴν βασιλείαν ἐπιτρέπειν Ἑστίᾳ λαβεῖν ὃ τι βούλοιο. τὴν δὲ πρῶτον μὲν παρθενίαν αἰτῆσαι, μετὰ δὲ τὴν παρθενίαν ἀπαρχὰς θουμένων αὐτῇ νέμεσθαι πρώτη παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. cf. scholl. *Av.* 865; *Thesm.* 299. interest quidem ut schol. *Thesm.* 299 rursus cite[m],<sup>5</sup> quia Vestam ut κουροτρόφον vim esse divinam liberos tuentem et defendentem una cum Tellure indicat: εἴτε τῇ γῇ εἴτε τῇ Ἑστίᾳ, ὁμοίως πρὸ τοῦ Διὸς θύουσιν αὐτῇ. Vestam certe κουροτρόφον dici affirmat Etym. Mag.<sup>6</sup> feriis Amphidromiis quibus nomen pueris dabatur. quocirca etiam schol. *Av.* 494 verbum ἑστιᾶν proprie adhibuit de hoc ritu locutus: ὅτι τὴν δεκάτην εἰστίων ἐπὶ τοῖς τικτομένοις, κτλ.

<sup>1</sup> Eustath. 182.

<sup>2</sup> Rosch. *Lex.*, p. 2617.

<sup>3</sup> 1. 40; cf. App. Prov. 1. 43 (vol. i., p. 385).

<sup>4</sup> *FHG.* iv. 336. 5.

<sup>5</sup> supra, p. 88.

<sup>6</sup> s. Ἀμφιδρομία. cf. Philodem. περὶ εἰσεβ., p. 23, Gomperz.

itaque sine dubio Vestae fiebant sacra tum cum novi servi domum ducerentur (schol. *Plut.* 768, 795).

scholium Iuntinum ad *Plut.* 395 inferioris admodum temporis est, licet haud falsa tradat: Vestam filiam esse Saturni, quod omnibus post Hesiodum<sup>1</sup> cognitum erat, aedificationem invenisse<sup>2</sup>; imaginemque in domis esse conditam, sicut Iovis Ephestii.<sup>3</sup> sed verba ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ eum in modum credo temperanda esse, ut non in aedibus sed in aula potius simulacrum positum foco praesedissee una cum Iove intellegamus. scholiasta autem nescio an cognoverit similem Vulcani effigiem ad aedium focum stetisse, quacum illam Vestae mente confuderit.

focum vero sacrosanctum fuisse testatur schol. *Ran.* 541, qui mortem Theramenis de curiae foco impie derepti memorat: ἐνιοὶ δὲ φασὶ καὶ καταφυγόντα αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐστίαν ἀποσπασθῆναι. eodem iure etiam porci, qui ad focum alebantur, Vestae aequae ac Cereri sacri habebantur; schol. *Vesp.* 844: χοιροκομείον ἐστὶν ἀγγεῖον τι ὅπου οἱ χοῖροι τρέφονται. Ἐστίας δέ, ἐπεὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐστίας<sup>4</sup> τρέφονται χοῖρους.

### Ποσειδῶν.

Minora tantum ac leviora praebet noster ad historias Neptuni cognoscendas. illum vero inter deos natu maiores<sup>5</sup> memorat *Plut.* 1050. finxit, ut videtur, haec de terrae motuum causis, ad *Nub.* 566: τὸν Ποσειδῶνά φησιν, ὃς τοὺς τε σεισμοὺς καὶ τὰς ἐν θαλάσῃ τρικυμίας ποιεῖ. τὰς μὲν ὡς κύριος ὢν τῶν ἀνέμων· σείει δὲ τὴν γῆν διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν τούτων ἀνέμων, εἰσιόντων εἰς τοὺς ἀδήλους πόρους αὐτῆς. huius scholii quamvis in Rav. et Ven. non iam exstantis testimonium firmat etiam schol. Rav. ad *Ran.* 825: ἀρχαία γὰρ ὑπόνοια τὸ ὑπὸ πνευμάτων κατεχομένην σείεσθαι τὴν γῆν. deinde versum senarium in illis verbis ὃς τοὺς τε . . . ποιεῖ latere valde suspicor. poetarum enim est illud τρικυμίας, quorum utique verba reminisci videtur

<sup>1</sup> *Theog.* 454. Ps.-Apollod. 1. 1. 5, Diod. 5. 68.

<sup>2</sup> vid. Rosch. *Lex.* 2624.

<sup>3</sup> vid. Preuner. *Hestia-Vesta*, p. 155.

<sup>4</sup> Preuner (Rosch., p. 2621), nimis temere: ἐπεὶ τῇ Ἐστίᾳ τρέφονται.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Serv. *G.* 4. 398.

scholiasta ad *Nub.* 567, qui, δοκεῖ γάρ, inquit, ὁ Ποσειδῶν οὐ τὴν θάλασσαν κινεῖν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν γῆν. cf. illud Pindaricum κινητῆρ γῆς.<sup>1</sup> sed quamquam Neptunum cum mare tum terras movere cognovit, falso tamen putare videtur hanc ob causam, quia mare regeret tutumque praestaret, neque autem ob illam potius, quia terram faceret solidam, eum cultum esse Ἀσφάλειον. namque τιμᾶται δὲ, ait, Ποσειδῶν ἀσφάλειος παρ' αὐτοῖς (nempe Atheniensibus) ἵνα ἀσφαλῶς πλέωσι (*Ach.* 682). quam vero causam, ut tuti incolumesque navigent, unus, ut videtur, praeterea testatur Appianus,<sup>2</sup> rectiores autem rationes attulit Cornut. 22, p. 193: θύουσιν αὐτῷ ἀσφαλείῳ πολλαχοῦ, ὥσαντι ἐπ' αὐτῷ κειμένου τοῦ ἀσφαλῶς ἐστάναι τὰ οἰκήματα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, κτλ. neque enim apud Athenienses solos Neptunus colebatur Ἀσφάλειος.<sup>3</sup> igitur cum et ipse Lacedaemonios illum coluisse deum memoret ad *Ach.* 510, fortasse vocabulum καί ante παρ' Ἀθηναίους in scholio *Ach.* 682 legendum est. scholium ad *Ach.* 510 hoc est: ἐνταῦθα (h.e. ad Taenarum promunturium) δὲ ἦν καὶ Ποσειδῶνος ἱερὸν Ἀσφαλείου. τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς εἰλωτας οἰκέτας καθεσθέντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος τοῦ Ταίναριου οὐδὲν δείσαντες ἀνέκλινον Λακεδαιμόνιοι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐδόκουν ἐναγείς εἶναι<sup>4</sup> (= Suid. s. Ταίναρον; cf. s. Ἀπίσπασε). verbum οἰκέτας in ἰκέτας mutandum esse iam vidit Schnee,<sup>5</sup> quod docet etiam Pausanias.<sup>6</sup> cum vero iam Meiners de hoc loco disputaverit<sup>7</sup> atque ad Thucydidem (1. 128) revocaverit auctorem, brevem licet mihi esse. vir doctus nullam ut videtur Pausaniae (4. 24. 2; cf. 7. 25. 1) habuit rationem, quem tamen operae est pretium conferre; hic enim, Λακεδαιμονίων ἄνδρες ἀποθανεῖν ἐπὶ ἐγκλήματι ὅτῳ δὴ καταγινωσθέντες, ἰκέται καταφεύγουσιν εἰς Ταίναρον. ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν ἐφόρων ἀπὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ σφῶς ἀποσπάσασα ἀπέκτεινε. Σπαρτιάταις δὲ ἐν οὐδενὶ λόγῳ θεμένοις τοὺς ἰκέτας ἀπήντησεν ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος μήνιμα, κτλ. primum vides quam Pausaniae verba ἐν . . . θεμένοις atque

<sup>1</sup> *Isthm.* 3. 37; cf. h. Hom. xxi. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *De Bell. Civ.* 5. 98; cf. 5. 100. contra, Xen. *Hell.* 4. 7. 4; Eratosthen. ap. Strab. 1, p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> Prell.-Plew.<sup>3</sup> i. 469, 477; Xen. l.c.; Paus. 3. 11. 8.

<sup>4</sup> cf. schol. *Eq.* 1225: μμῆται τοὺς εἰλωτας, ὅταν στεφανῶσι τὸν Ποσειδῶνα.

<sup>5</sup> *Beitrag zur Kritik der Aristoph.-Schol.*, p. 7.

<sup>6</sup> 4. 24. 2.

<sup>7</sup> pp. 279-280.

scholiastae οὐδὲν δαίσαντες inter se congruant. tum notandum est, periegetam Suidamque (s. Ἀπέσπασε), Hilotarum memoria plane omissa minus quam nostrum, qui eos memoravit, accurate secutos esse Thucydidem.

unicam paene de Neptuni filio Halirrhothio, qui dum Minervae arbores caederet, quae postea idcirco μορίαι vocarentur, patris causa ab illa superati, mortem ipse obierit, refert fabellam scholium recentius ad *Nub.* 1005, quam paucis mutatis solus ni fallor repetit Servius (*G.* 1. 18). plane autem diversam tradiderunt historiam Attici plerique,<sup>1</sup> interfectum Halirrhothium a Marte ob stuprum filiae Alcippae. accedit quod ne Suidas<sup>2</sup> quidem hanc fabulam tradidit, quamquam s. μορίαι eam tangere videtur. cum vero ita res se habeat, equidem Servium arbitror haec a Symmacho aequali suo didicisse, quae ab eodem Symmacho etiam in nostra scholia fluxerint.

doctrina eorum<sup>3</sup> qui Neptuni religionem maxime in Peloponneso obtinuisse<sup>4</sup> sciebant, plurimum valere videtur ap. schol. *Lys.* 403: τὸν Ἀλυκόν. . . . τινὲς δὲ ὑπονοοῦσιν ἀπὸ πόλεως Πελοποννησίων Ἀλύκου,<sup>5</sup> ἐνθα τιμᾶται ὁ Ποσειδῶν.

sed ad Apollodori librum qui de navium catalogo scriptus erat, ut suspicor, referre licet quae de deo in Geraesto promunturio culto dicit schol. *Eg.* 561, cum Strabo (10. 447; cf. 9. 405) illum secutus,<sup>6</sup> ut ante monui, eadem fere de terra Euboica illi deo sacra adhibuit, eodemque modo quo scholiasta (ad *Ran.* 825; cf. supra, p. 119) motus explicavit terrae.

non autem de Apollodoro, sed de Dionysio, quem Diodorum in quarto libro esse secutum saepius commemoravi, pendet schol. *Lys.* 138,<sup>7</sup> cuius partem priorem licet ex Sophoclis Tyro ductam esse videamus, posteriorem tamen facile concedes cum Diodoro cognatam:

<sup>1</sup> Tu vide sodes Ps.-Apollod. 3. 14. 2; Hellenicorum ap. E. M. 139. 18 (cf. 590. 46); Suid. s. Ἀπειος πάγος; Philoch. ap. Steph. Byz. s. Ἀπειος πάγος; Marm. Par. 5 (*CIG.* 2374); Bekk. *An.* 444. 12; schol. Eur. *Orest.* 1648; schol. Iuv. 9. 101; cf. etiam Eur. *I. T.* 945; *El.* 1258; Dem. c. *Aristocr.* 66.

<sup>2</sup> quippe qui Philochorum potius sequitur (s. Ἀπειος πάγος).

<sup>3</sup> Fortasse de Philostephano pendentium, vid. supra, p. 116.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Diod. 15. 49.

<sup>5</sup> Steph. B. s. Ἀλυκος.

<sup>6</sup> Niese, *Mus. Rhén.* 32. 267 sq.

<sup>7</sup> minus accurate Suid. s. οὐκ ἐρῶς.



Cod. Ven.

Diod. 4. 68.

ὁ γὰρ Ποσειδῶν ἐμίγη (τῇ)<sup>1</sup> τῇ δὲ Τυροῖ παρθένῃ κατ' ἐκείνους  
 Τυροῖ καὶ ἐγέννησε Νηλέα καὶ τοὺς χρόνους οὕτῃ, μιγείς Ποσει-  
 δῶν ἐγέννησε Πελίας καὶ Νηλέα.

lexicographis Didymo adstipulantibus nititur scholiasta *Av.* 559 de Alope: Ἀλόπη Κερκύνος θυγάτηρ, ἣς καὶ Ποσειδῶνος υἱὸς Ἰπποβόων, cuius tamen auctores superiores fuerunt Hellanicus et Euripides.<sup>2</sup>

atqui alio in loco (*Plut.* 718) noster, si Apollodorum penitus cognovisset, eum ad rem illustrandam adlaturus fuit, cum praesertim alium quidem Alexandrinum Callistratum laudaverit. nam de Teno insula dicit Apollodorus<sup>3</sup>: Τῆνος δὲ πόλιν μὲν οὐ μεγάλην ἔχει, τὸ δ' ἱερὸν τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος μέγα ἐν ἄλσει τῆς πόλεως ἔξω, θείας ἀξιοῖν. Neptunum autem auctore Philochoro in hac insula esse cultum ut ἱατρόν dicit Clemens<sup>4</sup>; eius vero signum fuit serpens, sicut Apollinis et Aesculapii.<sup>5</sup> at tamen de ipsa Teno insula locutus noster prorsus de Neptuno silet, serpentes autem solum memorat ibi fuisse multos. quod meo quidem iudicio non alienum erat proferre, nam ex rebus quoque omissis nonnunquam licet perspicere quoad scholiasta suam cognitionem extenderit.

### Ζεὺς, Ἥρα.

Iovem in Arcadia non Creta, natum altumque esse ab antiquis mentio facta est rara. tanto igitur magis oportet scholiastae de hac re testimonium audire (*Nub.* 1468): πατρώος Ζεὺς καὶ Ἀπόλλων ἐν Ἀθήναις τιμῶνται, ὁ Ζεὺς μὲν μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ, ἥ ὡς ἕτεροι, μετὰ τὴν ἐν Κρήτῃ ἀνατροφὴν, κτλ. quae de Iovis ex Arcadia origine hic adferuntur ea contendisse ipsos Arcades tradit Pausanias in Arcadicis<sup>6</sup>: καὶ τὴν Κρήτην ἐνθα ὁ Κρητῶν ἔχει λόγος τραφῆναι Δία τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο εἶναι (nempe oppidum Arcadicum), καὶ οὐ τὴν νῆσον ἀμφισβη-

<sup>1</sup> e Suid. et Diod.

<sup>2</sup> Harp. s. Ἀλόπη (Suid. s.v.; Bekk. *AN.* 380).

<sup>3</sup> ap. Strab. 10. 487.

<sup>4</sup> *Protr.*, p. 26, Potter.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Harr. et Verr., pp. 441-442. etiam Neptunus deus fatidicus habebatur in Achaia; Diod. 15. 49; Ael. *H. A.* 11. 19.

<sup>6</sup> 8. 38. 2.

τοῦσιν οἱ Ἀρκαῖες. tum videmus, quod sane viros doctos non fefellit,<sup>1</sup> scholiastam, qui non Apollinem modo sed etiam Iovem πατρός apud Atheniensis cultum esse affirmat, Platonis verbis repugnare (*Euthyd.* 302 C<sup>2</sup>): οὐκ ἔστιν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, αὐτῇ ἡ ἑπωνυμία [Ζεὺς πατὴρ] Ἰώνων οὐδενί. quo rectius nostrum tradidisse confirmat titulus in Chio insula inventus.<sup>3</sup>

huc adfero etiam scholium in *Nub.* 2 de Iove Atheniensium rege: τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις πυθόχρηστον<sup>4</sup> ἐγένετο καταλῦσαι μὲν τὰς βασιλείας, προστήσασθαι δὲ καὶ σέβειν Δία βασιλέα. Iovem regem praecipue Athenis appellatum ostendit Spanheim.<sup>5</sup> praeterea Erythris inscriptio inventa est quae Iovem regem ac deum aliquem Πυθόχρηστον una commemorat.<sup>6</sup> hinc poetae filiam quandam Iovis finxerunt βασιλείαν, ut ait Euphronius ap. schol. *Av.* 1536, quod haud dubio ex illo Homericο διοτρεφέης de regibus dicto exortum est.

Iovis cognomina alia sine fabulis narratis memorat hic illic noster ἀγοραῖον (*Eg.* 410, 500), δούλιον (*Ran.* 756), ἑταιρεῖον (*Ran.* 756), ἐφέστιον (*Iunt. Plut.* 395), ἱέσιον (*Ran.* 756), μελίχιον (*Eg.* 500), ξένιον (*Eg.* 500, *Ran.* 756), ὁμάδελφον (*Ran.* 756), ὁμόγιον (*Ran.* 756), φῶλιον (*Eg.* 500). vide schol. *Ran.* 756: ὥσπερ φαμὲν ἑταιρεῖος Ζεὺς καὶ ὁμόγιος καὶ ξένιος καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, οὕτω καὶ δούλιος, ὁ τῶν δούλων ἔφορος, quod nec in Rav. nec in Ven. conservatum recentissimum habendum est, cum cognatum esse videatur cum scholio ad Eur. *Hec.* 345 a Schwartzio reiectum.

Iovis qui Ἑλλάδιος appellabatur cultum in Aegina instituisse Aeacus fertur *Eg.* 1253, quod adeo cum schol. Pind. *Nem.* 5. 17, convenit ut vix ab eodem fonte utrumque fluxisse negemus, licet noster, id quod in *Equitum* scholiis admodum frequenter accidit,<sup>7</sup> auctorem suum parum intellexerit. sed cum de rebus Aegineticis Theagenis libro περὶ Αἰγίνης scholiastam Pindari saepius usum esse constat,<sup>8</sup> ad illum ea quae noster dixit reducenda sunt.

<sup>1</sup> Lobeck, *Ag.* 769, 771; Kock ad *Nub.* 1468.

<sup>2</sup> vid. supra, p. 98 et adn. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Ditt. *Syll.* 360. 35, eiusque adn. 7. πατήριος quoque Iuppiter dicitur ap. schol. *Eg.* 255.

<sup>4</sup> vid. p. 117, adn. 7.

<sup>5</sup> ad Callim. in *Iov.* (p. 30).

<sup>6</sup> Ditt. *Syll.* 370, 110.

<sup>7</sup> cf. *Eg.* 255, 566.

<sup>8</sup> cf. schol. *Nem.* 3. 21; *FHG.* iv. 508; schol. Plat. *Ap.* 19 C.

Iovem *καταιβάτην*<sup>1</sup> num recte idcirco vocari affirmavit scholiasta ad *Pac.* 42 quod fulmina deiciat, vel quod ipse aut fulminibus aut propter mulierum amores desuper caelo descendat, equidem valde dubito. Prellerus sane nostro adeo consentit, ut illud *καταιβάτης* Iovis Tonantis proprium esse accipiat.<sup>2</sup> atqui nulla est causa quin Iuppiter inde principio ita appellatus sit quia sicut ille *καταχθόνιος* deus esse inferorum crederetur. ac Mercurium profecto *καταιβάτην* idcirco nominatum esse apud Athenienses Rhodiosque memorat schol. *Pac.* 650. est profecto satis mirum, idem verbum bis in *Pacis* scholiis diverso sensu audiri. sed ut meam stabiliam opinionem Apollodorus advocatus mihi adstet; nam scholiasta Soph. (*O.C.* 701), *Μόριον Δία*, inquit, *ἔπεν τὸν ἐπόπτην τῶν μορίων ἐλαιῶν· καὶ ἔστιν ὁ λεγόμενος Μόριος Ζεὺς περὶ Ἀκαδήμειαν, ὡς φησιν Ἀπολλόδωρος· περὶ Ἀκαδημίαν ἔστιν ὁ τε τοῦ καταιβάτου Διὸς βωμός, ὃν καὶ Μόριον καλοῦσι, τῶν ἐκεῖ μορίων παρὰ τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν ἰδρυμένων.* quoniam igitur ille vir rerum divinarum peritissimus *Μόριον* et *Καταιβάτην* ad eundem Iovem pertinere putabat, *μόριον* autem Iovem oleasque *μορίας* ita appellatas esse constat e prisca arborum religione et veneratione, quae hominum vitae mortique praesidere, eisque arte coniunctae esse credebantur,<sup>3</sup> ergo idem prope significare paret illud *καταιβάτης* ac *καταχθόνιος*.

erant qui Iovem *σωτήρα* ab *ἐλευθερίῳ* non diversum esse putarent, ut testatur schol. *Plut.* 1175, ex quo patet et scholiastam huic opinioni adsentiri. nam *ἐν ᾧσται*, id est prope porticum regalem (*στοὰν βασιλείων*), Iovis Eleutherii statua erat, teste Pausania<sup>4</sup>; eiusdem autem imaginis mentionem fecit Isocrates,<sup>5</sup> qui tamen *τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Σωτήρος* scripsit.<sup>6</sup>

De Iunonis quidem cultu leviuscula traduntur, nempe quod Athenienses numquam eam in tanto honore quanto Samii aut Argivi habebant.<sup>7</sup> pronubam tamen colebant (schol. *Thesm.* 973):

<sup>1</sup> de forma verbi cf. *παραβάτης*, *CIA.* 1. 5; *διαβολία*, Pind. *P.* 2. 76.

<sup>2</sup> Prell.-Robt. i. 154. vide L. et S. *Lex.* s.v., qui etiam Iovi Elicio deo Romanorum illum adsimulant.

<sup>3</sup> vide Mannhardt, *Antike Wald- u. Feld-Kulte*, p. 26 et adn.

<sup>4</sup> 1. 3. 2.

<sup>5</sup> 9. 57.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Ditt. *Syll.* 63. 65, adn. 13; M. Schmidt, *Didymi Frag.*, p. 319.

<sup>7</sup> Prell.-Robt. i. 162.

Ἡρα τελεία καὶ Ζεὺς τέλειος ἐτιμῶντο ἐν τοῖς γάμοις, ὡς πρυτάνεις ὄντες τῶν γάμων. ceterum verbum illud πρυτάνεις utpote apud poetas lyricos usitatum, est praecipue notandum.<sup>1</sup> De Iove atque Iunone conubio praesidibus cf. etiam schol. *Lys.* 217, schol. *Iunt. Plut.* 1110 (Dübner, p. 607).

nuptias Iovis et Iunonis sic invenimus relatas (*Ven. Pac.* 1126): Καλλίστρατός φησι τόπον Εὐβοίας τὸ Ἑλύμνιον, Ἀπολλώνιος δὲ ναόν (lege νῆσόν) φησιν εἶναι πλησίον Εὐβοίας. νυμφικὸν δὲ τινες αὐτό φασιν, ὅτι ὁ Ζεὺς τῇ Ἡρᾷ ἐκεῖ[σε] συνεγένετο, κτλ. mirum sane est quod dicitur Elymnum *aedem* fuisse *prope* Euboeam; emendavi igitur e Steph. B. s. Ἑλύμνιον· νῆσος Εὐβοίας, πόλιν ἔχουσα, κτλ. ceterum totam Euboeam sacram Iunoni fuisse docet schol. *Ap. Rh.* 4. 1138, quod hoc indicat tantum, in Euboea regionibusque finitimis illam singulari in honore habitam esse et vel maxime apud rusticos, qui nuptias quotannis simulacris Iovis et Iunonis in plaustribus vectis celebrabant, id quod ex eodem Stephano patet s. Κάρυστος· ἐκλήθη δὲ τὸ ὄρος [Ὀχλ] ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκεῖ ὀχείας, ἣτοι τῶν θεῶν μίξεως Διὸς καὶ Ἡρας. atque haud dissimiles ut videtur caerimonias rure fortasse in urbem translatas egisse Athenienses testatur Phot. s. *ἱερὸν γάμον* (= *E. M.* 468. 52).

nuptiis<sup>2</sup> illis poetam secutus Ἔρωτα vel Amorem tradit noster adstitisse (*Av.* 1737). his etiam genitos esse duos tantum liberos legitimos (*Av.* 1653): εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ τῷ Διὶ γνήσιοι υἱοὶ Ἄρης καὶ Ἥφαιστος. videmus nullam Hesiodi rationem scholiastam habere, cum is dixerit (*Theog.* 927):

Ἥρη δ' Ἥφαιστον κλυτὸν οὐ φιλότῃτι μεγέεσσι  
γείνατο, καὶ ζαμένῃσιν καὶ ἤρισι ᾧ παρακοίτῃ,

nempe propter Minervam e Iovis capite natam. Ganymeden Iovis amasium novit scholiasta (*Pac.* 724).

Pausanias<sup>3</sup> statuam commemoravit Iovis in Larisa Argivorum tres oculos habentis, quia trium orbis regionum, aeris, maris, inferorum dominus esset.<sup>4</sup> hanc vero sententiam, cum plerique tradiderint eas

<sup>1</sup> *Pind. P.* 6. 24; *Stesich. ap. schol. Il.* 6. 507 (tamen cf. schol. *Pac.* 212, τῶν θεῶν πρυτανεύοντων ὑμῶν τὴν εἰρήνην del.).

<sup>2</sup> *Rosch. Lex.*, p. 1349.

<sup>3</sup> 2. 24. 3.

<sup>4</sup> similia Agias ac Dercylus ap. schol. *Eur. Troad.* 16.

rem utpote sophista rhetorque narrat fusius; huius autem verbis patet fabulam illam inter Athenienses vulgo relatam esse.

in Sicilia potissimum cultam esse Proserpinam, unde a Dite raptam in inferos esse sublatam fertur, tradit schol. *Vesp.* 1438,<sup>1</sup> cuius verba e Cornuto<sup>2</sup> fere delibata esse nondum puto viros doctos animadvertisse. neque vero absurda esse antiquis quidem videbatur illa nominis Κόρη e κόρη id est satietate origo, cum etiam gulam et cibi aviditatem pro numine inter Siculos haberi testatur Polemo apud. Athen. 10, p. 416.<sup>3</sup> distant autem noster et Cornutus a Ps.-Apollodoro,<sup>4</sup> quod hic Proserpinam tradit coactam esse ut tertiam partem anni apud Plutonem maneret.

rupes fuit Ἀγέλαστος ita nominata in Attica, cui Ceres filiam lugens insedissee fertur a schol. Ven. *Eq.* 785: ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ἀγέλαστος πέτρα καλουμένη παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις . . . ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐκάθισεν (ἐκαθίσθη Suid. s. Σαλαμῖνος, Hesych. s. Ἀγέλαστος πέτρα, Zenob. 1. 7) ἡ Δημήτηρ κλαίονσα ὅτ' ἐζήτει τὴν κόρην. quod, cum idem apud proverbiorum scriptores<sup>5</sup> servatum sit, inter Didymi proverbialia referenda esse arbitror. sed de raptu Proserpinae ea quae codices inferiores deinceps exhibent e Ps.-Apollodoro (1. 5. 1) nescio quis exscripsit.<sup>6</sup>

Ceres ut dea patria, cum eam in domum accepisset Celeus, magna reverentia Athenis colebatur (schol. Ven. *Eq.* 698). Triptolemus quidem hic ignoratur.<sup>7</sup> habent autem verba codicum deteriorum cum Ps.-Apollodoro (1. 5. 3 sqq.) similitudinem, ut liceat fortasse hoc scholium totum ex eodem fonte haustum esse putare:

Schol.

Ps.-Apollod.

καὶ ἄρμα δρακόντων ἐφ' ᾧ τε ἐπὶ  
πᾶσαν διασπείρει τὴν οἰκουμένην.

δίφρον . . . πτηνῶν δρακόντων τὸν  
πυρὸν ἔδωκεν ᾧ τὴν ὅλην οἰκουμένην  
δι' οὐρανοῦ φερόμενος (Triptole-  
mus) κατέσπειρε.

<sup>1</sup> hanc quidem historiam tradiderant Carcinus tragicus et Pindarus; Förster, *Raub u. Rückkehr d. Pers.*, p. 66. Phanodemus autem ab Attica eam esse raptam affirmat, schol. Hes. *Theog.* 914. <sup>2</sup> *N. D.* 28, pp. 207, 210.

<sup>3</sup> sed ad nomen recte intellegendum utilia sunt quae de superstitionibus rusticorum nuper protulit Frazer, *G.-B.* 1. 349, cf. 356.

<sup>4</sup> 1. 5. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Zenob. 1. 7, Diogenian. 1. 8, Apostol. 1. 12.

<sup>6</sup> haud dissidentia a Pampho ap. Paus. 1. 39. 1. cf. etiam Agatharchidem, *Geog. Min.* 1. 116.

<sup>7</sup> sicut in h. Hom. in *Cer.*, quem ex Attica fuisse oriundum negant Bergk i. 769, Wilam. *Aus Kydathen*, p. 125.

at Didymus, qui lyricos de hac re legerat, Celei filium fuisse Triptolemum certe cognoverat; in scholiis enim Hesiodeis (*Theog.* 914<sup>1</sup>) ἡρπάζθαι δὲ inquit, τὴν Περσεφόνην φασὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκ Σικελίας, Βακχυλίδης δὲ ἐκ Κρήτης, κτλ. quod conferendum est cum schol. *Ach.* 47: ἱερεὺς Δημήτρας<sup>2</sup> καὶ Τριπτολέμου ὁ Ἀμφίθεος. πέπαικται κωμικῶς ταῦτα. Κελεοῦ γὰρ Τριπτόλεμος . . . τοῦ δὲ Κελεοῦ μέμνηται Βακχυλίδης διὰ τῶν Ὑμνων.

iam exposuerunt viri eruditi<sup>3</sup> nomen Celei ab ave cognomini derivatum esse, quae pici similis fuerit, picum autem augurio ab agri cultoribus consultum esse; quocirca mihi quidem ultro licet affirmare fabulam de Celeo e fama illorum ostentorum quibus primam Cererem usam esse ferunt ansam cepisse atque exortam esse. cf. schol. *Av.* 721: ταῦτα δὲ πάντα Δημήτερι ἀνέκειτο, ὥς φησι Φιλόχορος, cum schol. *Pind. Olympt.* 12. 10, χρήσασθαι δὲ αὐτοῖς πρώτην Δημήτραν. eadem fere habent et Hesychius et Suidas (s. ξυμβόλους), quo constat Didymum haec confecisse.

huc proprium mihi videtur aliud scholium a Philochoro pendens adferre (*Ran.* 1033): τὸν Μουσαῖον παῖδα Σελήνης καὶ Εὐμόλπου Φιλόχορος φησιν (*FHG.* i. 416, 200). οὗτος δὲ ἄρα λύσεις καὶ τελετὰς καὶ καθαρμούς συνέθηκεν, κτλ. ubi ἄρα λύσεις scripsi pro illo παραλύσεις quod codices exhibent; cf. *Plat. Rep.* 2. 364 E; Siebel. *Philoch. frag.* p. 102.

de illa Cerere quae Ἀχαία dicebatur haec refert schol. *Ach.* 708<sup>4</sup>: Ἀχαιᾶν δὲ αὐτὴν ἐκάλουν ἀπὸ τοῦ κτύπου τῶν κυμβάλων καὶ τυμπάνων τοῦ γενομένου κατὰ τὴν ζήτησιν τῆς Κόρης. Ven.: ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἤχου ὃν παρῆχε τοῖς περὶ τὴν Γέφυραν εἰς Ἀθήνας ἀπιοῦσιν. ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ περὶ τὴν θυγατέρα ἄχους. quod vero Ven. traditur deam ita appellatam esse propter ἄχος, id est luctum amissae Liberae, Didymo hoc tribuendum est.<sup>5</sup> sed ἄχος idem esse atque ἦχος, vel sonitum cymbalorum a dea filiam quaerente pulsorum, id quod in priore parte scholii

<sup>1</sup> vid. *Flach. Glossen u. Scholien*, p. 118, cf. p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> usitatio haec est forma in *Rav. Lys.* 148, *Pac.* 2. 14, *Thesm.* 298; *Lobeck, Paralip.* 142.

<sup>3</sup> *Creuzer-Guign.* iii., p. 711; *Dar. et Sagl.*, p. 1037.

<sup>4</sup> adde *Orionis Etymol.*, p. 18 (*Dind.-Düb.*, p. 394), ubi adscriptum οὕτως εἶπον ἐν ὑπομνήματι εἰς Ἀρστοφάνην. cf. eadem ap. schol. *Stob. Ecl.* 3. 461 (ed. *Herm.*).

<sup>5</sup> *M. Schmidt, Didymi Frag.*, p. 80; *Etym. Gud.*, p. 98; *Hesych.* Ἀχαία.

profertur, Apollodorum etiam censuisse testatur schol. Theocr. 2. 36, qui de cymbalorum usu in mysteriis loquitur, quibus luctum deae imitentur.

vix sane ab ipsa dea distinguendae sunt illae Κουροτρόφος ac Καλλιγένεια Cereris satellites. principio enim, ut fieri solet, epitheta fuerunt ipsius Cereris;<sup>1</sup> Apollodorus autem (apud Photium s. Καλλιγένεια) non diversas a Tellure dixit fuisse.<sup>2</sup> post demum epitheton ab ipsa dea seiunctum in genium vel δαίμονα conversum est. sic noster ad *Thesm.* 298 de illa Καλλιγενεία: δαίμων περὶ τὴν Δήμητραν, ἣν προλογίζουσιν ἐν ταῖς ἑτέραις Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις ἐποίησεν (cf. Hesych. Suid. s.v.): licet fortasse nobis comparare Luxuriam in Plauti prologo Trinummi. scholium deinde quod sequitur de Κουροτρόφῃ ex Atticarum scriptore rerum quodam haud dubie excerptum est: εἴτε τῇ γῇ εἴτε τῇ ἐστίᾳ, ὁμοίως πρὸ τοῦ Διὸς θύουσιν αὐτῇ, quem morem primum instituisse Erichthonium narrat Suidas.<sup>3</sup>

#### Διόνυσος.

Primo mihi est disputandum de illo Baccho mystico qui una cum Cerere Liberaque in mysteriis ritibusque arcanis honorem habuit praecipuum. nam licet citius in cultorum mentibus hunc Iacchum cum altero Baccho Semelae filio mixtum esse et plane confusum perspiciamus, ut mystae, id quod minus convenit, exclamarent Σεμελήϊ' Ἰακχε πλουτοδότα (*Ran.* 479 et schol.), principio tamen ii di separandi sunt, quod etiam noster cognovisse videtur ad *Ran.* 398, quem nihilominus hac quaestione confusum esse patet e *Ran.* 324, cf. *Ran.* 404.<sup>4</sup> Iacchum autem Proserpina natum esse nonnullis testibus dicit schol. *Ran.* 324: μία τῶν μυστηρίων ἐστὶν ἡ εἰκάς, ἐν ᾗ τὸν Ἰακχὸν ἐξάγουσι . . . συνίδρυται τῇ Δήμητρει ὁ Διόνυσος. εἰσὶ γοῦν οἱ φασὶ Περσεφόνης αὐτὸν εἶναι· οἱ δὲ τῇ Δήμητρει συγγενέσθαι . . .

<sup>1</sup> Hesych. s. Καλλιγένεια: eadem ratione et Callisto, Euclia, Iphigenia, Dianae nomina, nymphae aut heroinae factae sunt.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Paus. 1. 22. 3.

<sup>3</sup> s. Κουροτρόφος. cf. Siebel. ad Paus. 1. 22. 3; supra, pp. 88, 118.

<sup>4</sup> scholium in *Ran.* 404 Symmachi esse videtur, quod docet illud εἰρηται. cf. Stein, p. 1.

lacunam in fine indicavi, quod nullo alio indicio Bacchum aut Zagrea aut Plutum coniugem fuisse Cereris conprobare potui; sed filium eum fuisse huius deae opinionem perantiquam reperies ap. Diod. 3. 62–64, schol. Aristid. 3. 648 Dind., ut fortasse sic complere sententiam liceat: οἱ δὲ τῇ Δήμητρι συγγενέσθαι τὸν Δία (vel potius Ἰασίωνα, *Od.* 5. 125, Hes. *Theog.* 970) καὶ τὸν Ἰακχὸν γεννῆσαι. at nescio an scholiasta illud Pindaricum (*Isthm.* 6. 3) πάρεδρος male audiverit.<sup>1</sup>

hic vero indicia quamvis obscura cernere licet fabularum inter rusticos agricolasque vulgarium qui, cum e segetibus opes divitiaeque eis proveniant, deum quendam Πλοῦτον fingunt e terra vel Cerere progenitum. cf. iterum illud Ἰακχε πλουτοδότα. similes enim superstitiones habent etiam hodie agrestes, ut docuit maxima cum scientia Frazerus in libro quem saepius memoravi. postea autem hunc eundem atque illum inferorum deum *Plutona* esse credebant (*E. M.* 406. 47), quocirca etiam noster, ut illius Bacchi vel Pluti mystici ignarus, ad *Thesm.* 298 “τῷ Πλούτῳ” adscripsit: ἀνδρὶ τῆς Περσεφόνης. huic porro Cereris vel Proserpinae filio nomen quoque *Σαβάζιον* datum esse tradit Diodorus.<sup>2</sup> sed noster Sabazium tanquam Thracium (schol. *Vesp.* 9) aut Phrygium (*Av.* 874) deum memorat, auctore Apollodoro.<sup>3</sup>

Nysam, ubi Bacchus natus esse credebatur, locum fuisse Arabicum tradit cod. Ven. ad *Ran.* 216, ubi maximi interest hoc observare, scholiastam cum Diodoro et Ps.-Apollodoro<sup>4</sup> convenire, ut omnes de Dionysio Scytobrachione videamus pendentes. at quod codice Θ praebetur Nysam regionem fuisse Aethiopicam, id quoque Dionysii habendum est, qui hanc sententiam ex Hecataeo adfert,<sup>5</sup> cui etiam Diodorus (1. 19. 4) adsensus est.<sup>6</sup> vinculum etiam artius cum illo Dionysio monstrat schol. Reg. 2 ad *Nub.* 311 (ap. Zacherum, p. 638);

<sup>1</sup> Dar. et Sagl., p. 1051; Prell. *Dem. u. Pers.*, p. 36; Suid. Hes. Phot. s. Ζαγρεός; Arr. *An.* 2. 16. 3 et maxime schol. Pind. *I.* 6. 3.

<sup>2</sup> auctore Dionysio Scytobrachione, Bethe, *Qu. Diod.* 1–24, 45; Diod. 4. 4, cf. 3. 64.

<sup>3</sup> Stein, p. xvi.

<sup>4</sup> Diod. 3. 65; Apollod. 3. 4. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Bethe, p. 32. cf. Schwartz, *Mus. Rhén.* xl (1885), p. 233; Herod. 2. 146, 3. 97, 111.

<sup>6</sup> Busolt, s. i. 159, adn. 3.



cf. Diod. 4. 2. Indicam quoque Nysam codd. inferiores memorant laudato Philostrato.<sup>1</sup>

Iovem cum Semela per ignem congressum esse brevissime narrat schol. *Nub.* 604, ut haud liceat eum cum Diod. 4. 2 et Ps.-Apollod. 3. 4. 3 conferre: μετὰ λαμπάδων καὶ πυρσῶν χορεύει. διάπυρος γὰρ ὁ θεός. καὶ ὁ Ζεὺς διὰ πυρὸς τῇ Σεμέλῃ συνήλθεν. sed eo fortasse, quod noster dicit in priore parte scholii, indicatur eum Bacchum pro numine quasi solari habuisse, id quod docuerant Orphici.<sup>2</sup> etenim idem διάπυρος de Apolline quoque solis numine dixit ad *Nub.* 571.<sup>3</sup>

Baccho sacrae erant hederæ, vitis, myrtus (schol. *Ran.* 330), quarum hanc ut matrem Semelam ex Orco, reditu ab Iunone impetrato, reduceret, Plutoni, qui sibi poposcerat id quod Baccho carissimum esset, per fallaciam dedit. hanc quidem fabulam ab aliis quoque traditam,<sup>4</sup> scholiasta, ut ipse ait, ab Iophone tragico didicit; neque vero licet statuere hæc nostrum ex auctore cognovisse Ps.-Apollodori (Dionysii), qui hæc tantum exhibuit (3. 5. 3): ὁ δὲ ἀναγαγὼν (verbum est etiam scholiastæ) ἐξ Ἀΐδου τὴν μητέρα καὶ προσαγορεύσας Θυώνην (de hac quidem noster tacet) μετ' αὐτῆς εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνήλθεν.

Bacchum deum fuisse iuniorem docet schol. *Plut.* 1050 (cf. *Ran.* 395); quod tamen de illius ætate Herculisque attulit grammaticus recentissimus in argumento iv. *Ranarum*,<sup>5</sup> Bacchum scilicet duobus sæculis maiorem natu quam Herculem fuisse, ab Herodoto<sup>6</sup> (2. 145) quidem plane discrepat.

ex oculis Lycurgi, quem fugiebat Bacchus, crambe orta est, ut ait schol. Ven. *Eg.* 539: φασὶ γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τοῦ Λυκούργου (βεβλαστηκέναι<sup>7</sup>). auctor de Lycurgi oculis Iovis ira praestricis praecipuus fuit praeter Homerum Eumelus, teste scholiasta *Il.* 6. 131, qui cum nostro eundem habuisse fontem videtur.<sup>8</sup> nunc verba in Veneto non servata respicienda sunt, quæ ad cognoscendum quem

<sup>1</sup> *Vit. Apollon.* ii. 2, p. 23. cf. Apollod. 3. 5. 2, Eust. ad Dionys. P. 1153.

<sup>2</sup> Macrob. 1. 18. 18. cf. Eleorum sententiam, *E. M.* 277. 46; Ioh. Lyd. *de mens.* 4. 38.

<sup>3</sup> etiam de Hecate (Luna) *Ran.* 1361.

<sup>4</sup> Paus. 2. 31. 2, cf. 2. 37. 5; Hor. *Od.* 2. 19. 29.

<sup>5</sup> Dind.-Dübner, p. 513.

<sup>6</sup> et Arr. *Anab.* 2. 16. 1.

<sup>7</sup> supplevit Dindorf.

<sup>8</sup> cf. Apollod. 3. 5. 1; Diod. 3. 65; Agatharch. *Geog. Min.* i. 116.

ad modum fabulae usque dispersae ac pervolgatae crescant utilissima sunt: ἡνίκα γὰρ ὁ Διόνυσος τοῦτον εὐλαβηθεὶς εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἔδωκε, ὑπὸ τῆς ἀμπέλου δεσμευθέντα δάκρυον ἐπαφεικέναι, καὶ τοῦ δακρύου τὴν κρόμβην. haec enim ab illis eo distant, quod nunc plantam videmus cramben non ex oculis Lycurgi praestricis nascentem, sed e lacrimis illi cadentibus cum iam vite numinis violati quasi catenis conligabatur. at quonam modo tandem fit ut ille vite dicatur esse vinculus, cum in carcerem eum esse compactum plerique tradiderint?<sup>1</sup> nam Sophocles ζεύχθη δ' ἐξύχολος παῖς, inquit, ὁ Δρύαντος, Ἡδωνῶν βασιλεὺς, κερτομοῖς ὄργαις, ἐκ Διονύσου πετρώδει κατάφαρκτος ἐν δεσμῷ, quibus verbis manifestum est illud πετρώδει proprio sensu dictum esse hic de cautibus montis Pangaei, quandoquidem Lycurgi poenas atque Antigoniae adaequat poeta. quod si huius interpretem consules veterem, eum intelleges miro in errore versari, qui τὸν δεσμὸν δὲ τῆς ἀμπέλου, ait, πετρώδῃ εἶπεν ἀντὶ τοῦ τὸν ἰσχυρόν! (cf. ad 958). quo patet scholiastam Sophoclis sicut nostrum etiam, usque de vite cogitasse qua Lycurgus vinculus fuerit. sed qua ratione fabula de crambe exorta est? id profecto ex poetae verbis insequentibus (*Ant.* 959-960) elucet: οὕτω τὰς μανίας δεινὸν ἀποστάζει ἀνθηρόν τε μένος, quibus secus acceptis et male intellectis grammatici Alexandrini illud de crambe et lacrimis finxerunt.

alterum autem dum fugit hostem Pentheum in Atticam ad Icarium deus pervenit (schol. *Eg.* 700): ὥς γὰρ ἡ Δημήτηρ τὰς τροφάς, οὕτω καὶ Διόνυσος Ἰκαρίῳ φιλοξενίας ἔδωκε δῶρον, ὅτι φιλοφρόνως αὐτὸν ὑπεδέξατο τὴν ὕβριν φεύγοντα τοῦ Πενθείως. mythographi vero solebant Cereris adventum et Bacchi comparare,<sup>2</sup> Ps.-Apollod. 3. 14. 7: ἀλλὰ Δήμητρα μὲν Κελεὺς ὑπεδέξατο, Διόνυσον δὲ Ἰκάριος, καὶ λαμβάνει παρ' αὐτοῦ κλῆμα ἀμπέλου. cf. schol. *Il.* 22. 29: ξενίσας δὲ ποτε ὁ Ἰκάριος Διόνυσον ἔλαβεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ οἶνόν τε καὶ ἀμπέλου κλῆμα. quibus conlatis fontem fuisse patet eundem. Didymus autem, si quidem scholiorum horum auctor est, Eratosthenis carmen quod Ἡριγόνῃ inscribatur consuluit.<sup>3</sup> ac de cultu Liberi Eleutheri, de quo iam satis disputavit Lobeckius,<sup>4</sup> scholium *Act.* 243 cum scholio

<sup>1</sup> Apollod. 3. 5. 1; Soph. *Ant.* 955 sq.

<sup>2</sup> cf. illud ξηρὰ καὶ ὑγρὰ τροφή saepius usitatum, schol. Pind. *I.* 6. 3.

<sup>3</sup> schol. *Il.* l.c.

<sup>4</sup> *Ag.* 660.

*Il.* 6. 131 coniungendum est; notanda enim est illa in utroque reperta locutio notabilis οὐκ ἀμυθί γε.

sed unde scholiasta ad *Plut.* 1021 (= Suid. Ἐρέχης) Staphylum didicerit Bacchi fuisse amasium me quidem plane fugit; nam filius, non amasius fuit, ut tradunt plerique.<sup>1</sup>

notabile certe id quoque est quod noster ad *Plut.* 1021 (= Suid. Μίδας<sup>2</sup>) autumat Bacchum Midas aures asini dedisse, aut etiam eum in asinum vertisse. asinos vero huic deo sacros fuisse notum est. nunc, quoniam eandem historiam repetiverint rarissimam proverbiorum scriptores, hanc credo e Didymi libro corrupte defluxisse, eum autem Apollinis historiam, qui aures Midas asininas, quod is Marsyam victorem in tibicinio iudicasset, dedisse fertur, hoc loco confudisse et contaminasse.<sup>3</sup> is tamen ut videtur aliam vetustiore cognovit fabulam, qua Midas et Bacchus coniuncti ferebantur.<sup>4</sup>

### Ἄιδης.

iam vero scholiastam quamquam vidimus in *Thesm.* 298 Plutum illum Cereris filium cum Plutone vel Dite inferorum rege, qui est Ζεὺς χθόνιος, confudisse, id quod sane haud mirabile est, tamen in *Plut.* 727 eos quodam modo dissimiles fuisse agnoscere eo ipso videtur, quod *similem* scilicet significationem ea nomina hoc quidem loco habere pretium curae esse existimat notare.

Ac Didymus certe de rebus quasi infernis et occultis penitus quaesiverat; laudatur quidem de rupe in Orco sita quae Αἰδαίου vocatur (*Ran.* 186; cf. 194); illius quoque est scholium in *Ach.* 388, ubi de Ditis pileo qui dicitur quod ibi fertur cum Suida et scholiasta Platonis<sup>5</sup> coniungendum est.

multa vero loca erant quae descensum in inferos prae-buisse fingebantur. nam in promunturio Taenari cavernam fuisse quae in

<sup>1</sup> Ps.-Apollod. 1. 9. 16; schol. Ap. Rh. 3. 997. cf. Tzetz. Lyc. 570; Parthen. *er.* p. 653, Western.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Diogenian. 6. 73; Apostol. 11. 67; Max. Tyr. 11. 1, p. 187; Ael. *V. H.* 3. 18; ignorat Tzetz. Lyc. 1401; cf. *Chil.* 103.

<sup>3</sup> Hygin. *Fab.* 191, quam historiam recentem esse docuit Creuzer, *Symbolik* iii. 225.

<sup>4</sup> Theopomp. *FHG.* i. 289; Paus. 1. 4. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Respub., p. 612 B.

Orcum deducat dicit schol. *Ach.* 510: Ταίναρον γάρ ἐστι τῆς Λακωνικῆς ἀκρωτήριον, ἐν ᾧ στόμα ἦν κατάγον εἰς Ἄιδου. quod simillimum est scholii in Pind. *P.* 4. 76, ubi Menandri mentione facta indicatur auctor Didymus.

atque lacus Avernus, ut notum est, prope ostium Orci fuit. scholiasta vero (*Ran.* 475) hunc in Iberia haud procul ab urbe Tartesso dicit fuisse, quod mire cum Strabone<sup>1</sup> convenit, qui dum causas profert cur in hominum mentes mentione illius Tartessi facta statim Tartarus quoque venerit, cum illa nomina usque semper coniuncta ultroque confusa sint, sic rem explicat (3, p. 149): εἰκάζοι ἂν τις ἀκούοντα περὶ Ταρτηρσοῦ τὸν Τάρταρον ἐκείθεν παρονομάσαι τὸν ἔσχατον τῶν ὑποχθονίων τόπων, προσθεῖναι δὲ καὶ μῦθον, τὸ ποιητικὸν σφίζοντα· καθάπερ καὶ τοὺς Κιμμερίους εἰδὼς ἐν βορείοις καὶ ζοφεροῖς οἰκήσαντας τόποις κατὰ τὸν Βόσπορον ἰδρυσεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς τῷ Ἄϊδι, κτλ. quid autem refert et illos Cimmerios huc inducere? non propter id solum, quod et eos habitare credebant regiones modo septentrionales modo occidentales, sed etiam quod ut Tartessum sic Cimmerios quoque ditissimos fuisse constabat; atque ut de Tartesso cum Tartaro coniuncta, sic de Cimmerios atque inferis simul homines cogitabant. nam omnibus quidem notum est divitiarum originem apud populos rudes incultosque dis inferis vulgo tribui.<sup>2</sup> itaque, sicut nanos exstitisse qui in metallis foderent Germani olim sibi fingeant, quos etiam “gnomos” et “cobaltos” nominatos divitias praebere putarent, Cimmerios pariter Graeci ferebant in fodinis operam navare atque prope Orcum incolere. cuius rei idem testis est Strabo (5, p. 244): καὶ τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον Πλουτώνιον τι ὑπελάμβανον καὶ τοὺς Κιμμερίους ἐνταῦθα λέγεσθαι· καὶ εἰσέπλεον γε οἱ προθυσάμενοι καὶ ἱλασάμενοι τοὺς καταχθονίους δαίμονας . . . Ἐφορος δὲ τοῖς Κιμμερίοις προσοικεῖων τὸν τόπον φησὶν αὐτοὺς ἐν καταγείοις οἰκίαις οἰκεῖν, ἃς καλοῦσιν ἀργίλλας, καὶ διὰ τινων ὀρυγμάτων παρ’ ἀλλήλους τε φοιτᾶν καὶ τοὺς ξένους εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον δέχεσθαι, πολὺ ὑπὸ γῆς ἰδρυμένον· ζῆν δ’ ἀπὸ μεταλλείας καὶ τῶν μαντευομένων. quibus adlatis iam potest intellegi

<sup>1</sup> 3, p. 150; 5, p. 244.

<sup>2</sup> cf. ipsum dei nomen Ditis vel Plutonis; Luc. *Tim.* 21, qui tamen false interpretatur *de Luctu* 2: διὰ τὸ πλουτεῖν νεκροῖς. cf. etiam Hes. *Opp.* 122–126; Plat. *Cratyl.* 398 A; etiam *Opp.* 465.

scholium ad *Ran.* 187: Κερβερίους δὲ τοὺς Κιμμερίους λέγει. περαιωθῆναι μὲν ἐκεῖ οὐκ ἔστι, κατάβασις δὲ εἰς Ἄιδου ἐκεῖ, ὡς μυθεύεται.

Ephorum igitur, quem non semper fabulas narrare operi esse suo alienum putasse notum est,<sup>1</sup> horum auctorem omnium fuisse e Strabone licet statuere.

### Εὐμενίδες.

Quae de Furiis deabus cognovit scholiasta cuncta a tragicis, non a mythographis pendent. verum enim Euripidis, qui Electram fecerat loquentem haec: *ὀνομάζειν γὰρ αἰδοῦμαι θεὰς Εὐμενίδας*,<sup>2</sup> videtur ante oculos habuisse, cum nomen Eumenidum ita a Graecis dictum scribebat, ut verbis male ominatis parcerent (schol. *Nub.* 265): οὐχ οὕτω λέγει τὰς Νεφέλας σεμνὰς θεὰς ὥσπερ τὰς Ἑρινύς. *ἐκτρεπόμενοι* (h.e. metuentes) πάντες ὀνομαστὶ λέγειν αὐτάς, Εὐμενίδας καὶ τὰς σεμνὰς θεὰς προσηγόρευσαν<sup>3</sup> (cf. *Eg.* 1312; *Thesm.* 224).

quo habitu Dirae in scaenam inductae a tragicis sint dicitur ad *Plut.* 423: εἰώθασιν οἱ τραγῳδοὶ Ἑριννύας εἰσφέρειν μετὰ λαμπάδων: cuius tamen rei unicum quod novimus exemplum exstat in Ennii Alcumaeone.<sup>4</sup> alterum scholium utique e commentariis integrioribus in tragoediam antiquam fluxisse videtur (*Ran.* 472): *περίδρομοι· οἷον πανταχοῦ δυνάμενοι περιστρέφεσθαι. λέγει δὲ τὰς Ἑρινύας.* huic adponendum schol. Eur. *Or.* 317, *δρομάδες· πανταχοῦ περιτρέχουσαι.*

ad earum delubrum in arce situm, quod et Thucydides (I. 26) et Pausanias (I. 28. 6) commemorant, intellegit noster confugere non servos sed quoslibet supplices, *Thesm.* 224: *ἄσυχον γὰρ εἶχον οἱ καταλαμβάνοντες τὰ ἱερὰ τῶν Ἑρινύων*, quo scholio elucet Kuesterum non dubitare oportuisse verbum *οἰκέται* in schol. *Eg.* 1312 repertum in *ἰκέται* mutare, quod quidem saepius corruptum invenitur.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> vid. supra p. 100, adn. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Orest.* 37-38.

<sup>3</sup> hoc scholium a Dübn. confuse editum ita interpunxi. melius sit si post *ἐκτρεπόμενοι* particulam γὰρ suppleamus.

<sup>4</sup> frag. 3, p. 113, Müll.; Rosch. *Lex.*, p. 1313; cf. Cic. *Legg.* I. 14. 40.

<sup>5</sup> cf. p. 120. erratum simile de templo Thesei ante Philochorum exstitit (*E. M.* 451. 42).

## IV.—DE HERCULE.

multa de Hercule memorantur, nimirum quod ea persona fuit comicis carissima. nam hi post Pisandrum<sup>1</sup> leonis pelle vestitum heroea inducebant (schol. *Ran.* 46), eiusque gulam inridebant (*Vesp.* 60, *Av.* 557, *Pac.* 741). scholium in *Lys.* 928 ad illa Ἡρακλῆς ξενίζεται· παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν βραδυνόντων, cum idem dent et Suidas et Apostolius,<sup>2</sup> apparet e Didymi proverbii sumptum esse.

haud raro offendimus inter *Equitum* scholia semidocta quaedam et quasi a tirone confecta; veluti id quod de Thebis Hercules patria urbe exponitur ad *Eg.* 480: ἀκολουθῶς δὲ τοῦ Ἡρακλείους ἐμνήσθη, ἐπειδὴ Θηβαίων ἴδιος ὁ θεὸς οὗτος εἶναι λέγεται, τῆς δὲ Βοιωτίας αἱ Θῆβαι πόλεις. doctius autem utpote ex Aristophane grammatico derivatum est argumentum primum ad *Ranas*: οὐ δεδήλωται μὴν ὅπου ἐστὶν ἡ σκηνή. εὐλογώτατον δ' ἐν Θήβαις. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Διόνυσος ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ πρὸς τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἀφικνέται, Θηβαῖον ὄντα.

labores eius aerumnasque tangunt scholia *Pac.* 752, *Nub.* 830, quorum e posteriore apparet numerum laborum Diagorae Melii tempore certum fuisse et fixum.

1. Augeae stabula purgat, schol. Ven. *Pac.* 753: δοκεῖ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς τὴν Αὐγείου κόπρον ἐκκεκαθαρκέναι. si quidem ea re nobis licet niti, quod Diodorus (4. 13) isdem quibus noster utitur verbis, Ps.-Apollodorus autem (2. 5. 5) pro illo κόπρον v. ὄνθον, pro ἐκκεκαθαρκέναι v. ἐκφορῆσαι, putandum est Diodorum, qui laudationem Herculis a Matri Thebano compositam compilavit,<sup>3</sup> cum nostro cognatum esse: sed verba scholiastae exiliora sunt quam ut de hac re certe diiudicemus.

2. cum angui Lernaea pugnat, *Pac.* 756, ubi cum centum capita Ὕδρα alibi non dicatur habuisse,<sup>4</sup> hoc nostrum e poetae verbis temere collegisse patet.

3. cum Geryona certat, *Ach.* 1082, ubi in Rav. tricipitem illum gigantem fuisse fertur, in Ven. autem tria corpora habuisse. Ravenatis testimonium firmat etiam schol. *Eg.* 416, cuius auctor, sicut

<sup>1</sup> Strab. 15. 688; Ps.-Apollod. 2. 4. 10.

<sup>2</sup> viii. 63.

<sup>3</sup> Bethe, *Qu. Diod.*, p. 44.

<sup>4</sup> novem habuit secundum Alcaeum et Ps.-Apollod. 2. 5. 2, quinquaginta secundum Simonid., Verg. *A.* 6. 576; cf. Eur. *H. F.* 419; Hesych. s. Ὕδρα.

Ps.-Apollodori,<sup>1</sup> fuit Hesiodus.<sup>2</sup> de vaccis illius quas abegit Hercules scholium describam cum aliis tum Lyco Regino dependens (*Pac.* 925):

I. περὶ δὲ τῶν λαρινῶν βοῶν Λύκος μὲν ὁ Ῥηγίνος ἐπὶ<sup>3</sup> ταῖς πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρόν φησιν ἀπὸ Λαρίνου τινὸς βουκόλου ταύτην αὐτοὺς τὴν προσηγορίαν ἐσχηκέναι. Ven.

II. εἰσὶ δὲ τινες οἱ παρὰ τὸν λάρον ἀξιοῦσιν αὐτοὺς οὕτω καλεῖσθαι. Ven.

III. αἱ δὲ τὴν ρι<sup>4</sup> συλλαβὴν δασύνουσιν, ἢ λαρίνοὺς τοὺς μεγαλόνοους· ἐν δὲ τῇ Χαονίᾳ φασὶ τοιοῦτους εἶναι βοῦς, οὓς καὶ Κεστρίνοὺς καλοῦσιν. Ven.

IV. ἄλλως. ἀντὶ τοῦ μεγάλῳ καὶ εὐτραφεῖ. Rav. Ven.

V. τοὺς δὲ ἡπειρωτικοὺς βοῦς οὕτω λέγουσιν ἀπὸ τινος Λαρίνου βουκόλου, παραλαβόντος παρὰ Ἡρακλέους τὰς Γηρυόνοῦ βοῦς. Rav. Ven. quibus adde etiam schol. *Av.* 465:

VI. ὡς ἐν Λαρίσση<sup>5</sup> μεγάλων βοῶν γενομένων. ἔστι δὲ πόλις Θεσπρωτίας. Ven.

VII. (= IV.) λάρινον ἀντὶ τοῦ λιπαρόν, κτλ. Rav. Ven.

VIII. (= I., V.) ἡ μεγάλοι, ἀπὸ Λαρινοῦ τινος βοσκοῦ εὐμεγέθους. νέμονται δὲ τὴν ἡπειρον, οὔσαι τῶν Γηρυόνοῦ βοῶν ἀπόγονοι. Rav. Ven.

Suidas, Photius, Apostolius 10. 45, haec quoque habent

IX. (= I., V., VIII.) λαρिनὸς βόες οἱ ἐν Ἡπείρῳ, ἀπὸ Λαρίνου βουκόλου κλέφαντος τὰς Ἡρακλέους βοῦς, ὡς Λύκος ὁ Ῥηγίνος, ὅτε τὰς Γηρυόνοῦ βοῦς ἤλανε.

X. Πρόξενος δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἀνεῖναι τινὰς τῷ Δωδωναίῳ Διί.

XI. (= IV.) Ἀπολλόδωρος δὲ αὐ τοὺς εὐτραφεῖς λαρινούς. λαρινεύειν γὰρ τὸ σιτεύειν.

his comparatis apparet Didymum, qui haud dubie haec confecit, fabulam Herculis ac Geryonae boum ex historicis Lyco Proxenoque sumpsisse, interpretationem autem verbi λαρινός ex Apollodoro illo fabularum scriptore.

de balneis Herculeis quae vocabantur quem ad modum dissederint poetae e schol. *Nub.* 1050 patet, ubi in Rav. Pisandri sententia servata

<sup>1</sup> 2. 5. 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Theog.* 287.

<sup>3</sup> ἐν? Leutsch. ad Apostol. 10. 45. vid. *FHG.* II. 370.

<sup>4</sup> idem Eustath. 1243. 11.

<sup>5</sup> Athen. 9. 376 C, ἡ ἀπὸ τινος κώμης Ἡπειρωτικῆς Λαρίσης (?) (cf. *Cram. An. Ox.* 3. 362. 20).

est: 'Ηρακλεί πολλά καμόντι περι Θερμοπύλας Ἀθηνᾶ θερμὰ λουτρὰ ἀναδέδωκεν. Πείσανδρος· τῷ δ' ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι θεὰ (R. θερμὰ) γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, ποιεῖ θερμὰ λουτρὰ παρὰ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης.<sup>1</sup> Thermopylis igitur solum, non autem alibi, Pisander balneas Herculeas per Minervam exstitisse narravit. sed quoniam poetae omnes Minervae Herculem familiariter coniunxerunt, quid mirum si alias quoque balneas Herculeas Minervae dona fuisse tradiderunt? cuius sententiae ipse Pisander postea ab imperitis profertur auctor, ut a Zenobio 6. 49, Suida s. Ἡράκλειος ψώρα. iam respiciendum est scholium Veneti, ubi non Minerva sed Vulcanus eas Herculi dedisse traditur, auctore Ibyco.<sup>2</sup> idem habet Suidas s. Ἡράκλεια λουτρά.<sup>3</sup> apud Hesychium quae leguntur e schol. Ven. et schol. Pind. O. 12. 27 composita sunt. lege autem ἀναφεῖναι pro eius ἀναφῆναι. atque alter lyricus Pindarus<sup>4</sup> alia concepit, qui nymphis balneas attribuit Siculis. plane absurda ac corrupta tradit scholiasta Soph. Trach. 632 τὰ Ἡράκλεια, ἀπερ λέγεται αὐτῷ ἢ Ἡρα δνεῖναι. haec enim illi fuit inimicissima.

4. miram fabulam de Diomede Thrace eiusque filiabus tradit scholiasta Eccl. 1029: ὅτι Διομήδης ὁ Θράξ πόρνας ἔχων θυγατέρας τοὺς παριόντας ξένους ἐβιάζετο αὐταῖς συνεῖναι, ἕως οὗ κόρον σχῶσι καὶ ἀναλωθῶσιν οἱ ἄνδρες. αἷς καὶ ὁ μῦθος ἵππους ἀνθρωποφάγους εἶπεν. eadem fere Suid. s. Διομήδεις ἀνάγκη. auctorem Clearchum Peripateticum fuisse docet Hesychius (s. Διομήδεις ἀνάγκη); is scilicet historiam Diomedis equarum inter Herculis labores a plerisque traditam suis rationibus utpote philosophus conatus est exponere.

5. pugnam Herculis cum Centauris tangit schol. Ran. 38.<sup>5</sup> accedit autem in codicibus Θ et Reg. (Dind.-Düb., p. 514) narratio de illorum ortu quae e Pindaricis ut videtur commentariis confecta est. cf. enim Pind. Pyth. 2; et hoc proverbium apud nostrum: ὥστε καὶ τις ἰδὼν αὐτοὺς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔφη, ἵππος ἀπερεύγεται ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἀποπέρδεται ἵππον, cum illo ap. schol. Germ. Pind. 2. 88 οἶον καὶ παροιμία ἵππος μὲν ἐρεύγεται ἄνδρα, ἄνθρωπος δ' ἐξαπέπερδεν ἵππον, cognatum est.

<sup>1</sup> vid. schol. II. 20. 74.

<sup>2</sup> vid. Schneidewin. ad Ibyc. Frag. xxx., pp. 180-182.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Apostol. 8. 66.

<sup>4</sup> Pind. P. 12. 25.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Suid. Hes. Phot.



6. Cycnum Martis filium interfecit Hercules, *Ran.* 963; quod scholium in codicibus recentioribus servatum item ab aliquo commentariorum Pindaricorum perito confectum est. cf. Pind. *Isth.* 4. 35, *Olymp.* 2. 82, 10. 17, schol. ad *Olymp.* 2. 82.

7. Hercules una cum Argonautis navigavit, *Plut.* 1127. cum hoc scholio Ps.-Apollodorus et scholiastae Apollonii et Theocriti<sup>1</sup> in eo conveniunt, quod Herculem illius expeditionis participem id temporis amasium faciunt amisisse Hylam. sed scholium *Pluti* integrum non est, quod ex illa nihili voce *θησου*<sup>2</sup> patet. ea praeterea quae codex Reg. servat e fonte proverbiorum deducta sunt.<sup>3</sup>

Herculem mysteriis Cereris initiatum traditur in codicibus recentioribus ad *Plut.* 845, in vetustioribus ad 1013. alter locus hic est: ἐπεὶ ἐστὶ καὶ μικρὰ μυστήρια γινόμενα δι' Ἡρακλῆα. Ἡρακλῆς γὰρ ἐπιστὰς ἡξίου μνεῖσθαι. ἔθος δὲ ἦν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ξένον μὴ μνεῖν. μὴ βουλόμενοι οὖν λῦσαι τὸ ἔθος μηδὲ ἀπῶσαι τὸν εὐεργέτην Ἡρακλῆα ἐπενόησαν μικρὰ μυστήρια εὐμετάδοτα. cum his si comparamus Tzetzae<sup>4</sup> scholium in Lyc. 1328, facile perspicimus Istrum huius fabulae auctorem fuisse. aliam autem causam cur non potuerit Hercules initiari fabularum adferunt scriptores, quod videlicet nondum lustratus fuerit a caede Centaurorum.<sup>5</sup>

Atthidographi certe alicuius est scholium *Ran.* 501, ubi illum legimus minoribus mysteriis esse initiatum in demo Melita a nympa quadem eiusdem nominis: ἐκλήθη δὲ ἀπὸ Μελίτης νύμφης, ἣ ἐμίγη δ' Ἡρακλῆς. cf. Philochorum ap. Harpocr. s.v. ἀπὸ Μελίτης θυγατρὸς κατὰ μὲν Ἡσιόδον Μύρμηκος, κατὰ δὲ Μουσαῖον Δίου τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. quod ex scholio hoc colligendum est ea mysteria minora in Melita demo celebrata esse, id cum Steph. B., qui Agris vico Herculem initiatum esse testatur, conciliare vix possum. Melitam autem Herculis concubinam fuisse alibi traditum non comperio, ut hic inepte fictum coniciam. haud dissimilis est fama quae de amoribus Herculis Diomique fertur *Ran.* 651 ubi origo indicatur feriarum quae Διόμεια

<sup>1</sup> Apd. 1. 19. 16, schol. Ap. Rh. 1. 1289, schol. Theocr. 13. 35; cf. Eust. ad Dionys. P. 805.

<sup>2</sup> in cod. Reg. *Θησέως*. legendum fortasse *Εὐρυσθέως*.

<sup>3</sup> cf. enim Zenob. 6. 21, Diogenian. 8. 33, Apostol. 8. 34.

<sup>4</sup> mendose a Tzetza et schol. 845 minora mysteria ἐν Ἐλευσίῃ celebrari dicuntur.

<sup>5</sup> Ps.-Apd. 2. 5. 12, Diod. 4. 14; cf. schol. *Il.* 8. 368.

vocabantur: δῆμος τῆς Αἰγίδος φυλῆς ἀπὸ Διόμου ἐρωμένου τοῦ Ἑρακλέους. ἔστι δὲ Ἑράκλειον αὐτόθι· περὶ οὗ καὶ Ῥιανὸς φησι δηλῶν ὅτι Δίοςμος Ἑρακλῆς ἐγένετο. sic in Veneto. verba extrema mutila videntur esse, nisi quidem putare volumus illud Δίοςμος quasi epitheton Herculi appositum esse. Rhianus Cretensis scripsit ποιήματα Ἑρακλειάδα teste Suida s.v.

Thessalos genus ex Hercule deduxisse docet schol. Ven. *Vesp.* 1271, ubi de penestis alia memorantur atque apud Suid. Phot. Hesych. s. Πενίσται; atque hi partim, Eustathius autem (954. 38) ad verbum omnia ex Athen. 6. 264 exscripsit; quibus si Didymus auctor est, noster eum non cognovit. verba nostri haec sunt: πενίστας δὲ λέγεσθαι φασὶ τὸ θητικὸν παρὰ τοῖς Θετταλοῖς. ἔθνος δὲ ἦν πάλαι ἀπὸ Πενίστου τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχον, ὃς ἀνέφερε τὸ γένος εἰς Θεσσαλὸν τὸν Ἑρακλέους.<sup>1</sup> quae vero maxime utilia sunt ad rem intellegendam quam O. Müllerus<sup>2</sup> putabat satis esse obscuram. is enim intellexit illud Athenaei (6. 264 a) οἱ μὴ γόνῳ δοῦλοι perperam ab alio explicatum esse: ἐλεύθεροι μισθῷ δουλεύοντες. sed e nostro scholio perspicere licet quid Athenaeus sibi velit. nam quoniam penestae genus suum ad heroas Thessalum atque Herculem referebant pristinis saltem temporibus necesse est ii nobilis fuerint.

quae de origine ludorum Olympiorum ab Hercule institutorum dicit scholiasta *Plut.* 586 ex Antig. Caryst. *Mir. Ausc.* c. 51 levibus cum mutationibus exscripsit.

historiam Heraclidarum tangit scholiasta ad *Plut.* 385. mox ad *Eq.* 1151 de eadem re locutus proverbium illud βάλλ' εἰς μακαρίαν interpretatur (cf. *Plut.* 782), ubi verborum discrepantias inter nostrum, Zenobium (2. 61), Eudociam (p. 76, cf. p. 284) intellegere non possum, nisi omnes e Didymi libello de proverbiiis singuli delibarent.

Eurysthei cum Atheniensibus pugnantis ab Iolao interfecti corpus in demo Gargetto, caput autem in Tricoryntho sepultum esse tradit Strabo (8, p. 377): τὸ μὲν ἄλλο σῶμα Γαργηττοῖ ταφῆναι, τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν χωρὶς ἐν Τρικορύνθῳ, ἀποκόψαντος αὐτὴν Ἰολάου περὶ τὴν κρήνην τὴν Μακαρίαν ὑπὸ ἀμαξιδόν.<sup>3</sup> καὶ ὁ τόπος καλεῖται Εὐρυσθεῖος κεφαλῇ. iam

<sup>1</sup> Thetthalum filium Herculis novit etiam schol. Ap. Rh. 3. 1089.

<sup>2</sup> *Dor.*<sup>2</sup> ii, p. 61, adn. 8.

<sup>3</sup> mendose schol. Pind. P. 9. 145 ἐν τῇ ἀμαξιδόν; nam de Eurystheo male accepit id quod de Iolao poeta dixerat.

cf. schol. *Thesm.* 899 ad verbum Γαργηττόθεν explicandum: ἀπὸ τῆς δῆμου τῆς Αἰγίδος φυλῆς, ἐνθα τὸ Εὐρυσθέως ἀπόκειται σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἀκρωτηρίῳ. mirum certe est illud ἀκρωτηρίῳ. lege ἐν τῷ Ἀρατηρίῳ, quod fanum fuisse, ita appellatum ex Eurysthei imprecationibus, testatur Plut. *Thes.* 35: . . . αὐτὸς (Eurystheus) δὲ Γαργηττοῖ κατὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀρὰς θέμενος, οὗ νῦν ἐστὶ τὸ καλούμενον Ἀρατήριον.

## V.—DE FABULIS ATTICIS.

Fabulas apud Athenienses vulgares constat maxime tractasse Aththidographos, ut iure liceat putare, quaecumque de his rebus inter scholia inventa erint magis ad illos, quam ad eos qui mythicarum potissimum rerum studiosi fuerint, referenda esse. quod praecipue de Theseo fabulisque ad eum pertinentibus valet.

nihilominus schol. *Vesp.* 313: ὁ λόγος ἐκ Θησεῶς Εὐριπίδου· ἐκεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα λέγουσιν οἱ ταττόμενοι παῖδες εἰς βορὰν τῷ Μινωταύρῳ, extrema verba habet communia cum Ps.-Apd. 3. 15. 7.<sup>1</sup> sed aliis in rebus mythographi qui Dionysium Scytobrachionem secuti sunt adeo a nostro distant ut hunc eundem auctorem inspexisse vix credamus. etenim ad *Eg.* 785 Thesea legimus Orco descendurum in rupe consedis prope Athenas quae Ἀγέλαστος vocaretur; quam plane ignorantes illi quidem<sup>2</sup> Theseum ac Pirithoum referunt per Taenarum, non ex Attica ad inferos descendisse. tamen scholium cod. Reg. ad *Ran.* 142 cum schol. Ap. Rh. 1. 101 in paucis convenit.

de rupe illa inferna mirabilem famam narrat schol. *Eg.* 1368 dum verbum ὑπολίσποις interpretatur: πλάττονται τὸν περὶ Θησεῶς μῦθον, ὅτι ἐλκόμενος ὑπὸ Ἡρακλείους κατέλιπεν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν τὴν πυγὴν. similiter Apostol. 3. 36, Suid. Hesych. s. λίσποι, schol. Plat. *Symp.* 193 A. alii qui de descensu Thesei Pirithoique disseruerunt haec plane ignorant<sup>3</sup>; suspicor igitur Didymum primum in corpore pro-verbiorum Atticorum pervolgasse.

<sup>1</sup> cui idem est auctor ac Diodoro, ut saepius monui. similia habet schol. Plat. *Min.* 321 A.

<sup>2</sup> Apd. 2. 5. 12; schol. Ap. Rh. 1. 101; Hygin. *Fab.* 79, qui mendose "per insulam Taenarum" habet.

<sup>3</sup> Plut. *Thes.* 35; Paus. 1. 17. 4; Ps.-Apd. 2. 5. 12.

Atticorum profecto fama fuit uxorem Theseum habuisse Hippolyten (*Ran.* 849). hoc enim tradiderat Clidemus,<sup>1</sup> quem secutus esse videtur ipse Istrus.<sup>2</sup> contra auctor Hygini<sup>3</sup> Antiopen eius uxorem fecit. scholium illud grammaticis Alexandrinis sine ulla dubitatione adscribo, quamquam in Ravennate et Veneto non iam servatur. cuius originis hoc leve sane sed nequaquam inane indicium est: dicit enim de incestu Megarei ac Danaae: ἐδόκει γὰρ τοῖς παλαιοῖς πάντῃ ἐναγὲς εἶναι ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς μίγνυσθαι, quod vero alibi quam in Aegypto, ubi, ut exemplo utar notabili, coniugium Cleopatrae ac Ptolemaei fratris neque turpe neque infandum esse habebatur, vix scribi potuit.

Amazonum praeter Hippolyten mentio facta est *Lys.* 679, 191.

Neptunum atque Thesea intime coniunctos et quasi mixto numine cultos esse notum est.<sup>4</sup> haud mirum igitur est si, ut ille equorum praeses fuit, sic huic currus πολεμοστηρίον inventio attribuitur a schol. *Nub.* 28.

alia autem plurima libenter antiqui a Theseo instituta esse dicebant<sup>5</sup> atque eum rem publicam Atheniensium populique etiam imperium fundasse. quo circa schol. Ven. *Plut.* 627 (v. 38) Isocratis verba (*Hel.* 35) repetit, cui haud dubie auctor fuit Thucydides (2. 15): ἐορτὴ δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπετελεῖτο, ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸς συνήγαγε τὴν Ἀττικὴν, πρότερον σποράδην καὶ κατὰ κώμας οἰκουμένην. item hercle in Rav. ibid. legimus haec: μετὰ τὸ χαρίσασθαι τὴν δημοκρατίαν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὸν Θησέα, Λύκος τις συκοφαντήσας ἐποίησεν ἐξοστρακισθῆναι (1) τὸν ἥρωα, κτλ. fabulam deinceps narratam videmus simillimam rursus esse Plutarchi.<sup>6</sup> sed Diodorus<sup>7</sup> in hac sui operis parte Dionysium secutus cum aliis tum eo discrepat ab nostro, quod nullam Lycomedis omnino mentionem fecit; is vero ut videtur Thesei templum asylum fuisse intellegit omnibus supplicibus, nec tantum servis. scholiasta tamen *Eq.* 1312 de hoc, ἐνταῦθα, inquit, οἱ καταφεύγοντες τῶν οἰκετῶν ἀσυλίαν εἶχον. possumus videlicet hic quoque in ἰκετῶν mutare<sup>8</sup>;

<sup>1</sup> *Plut. Thes.* 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Athen.* 13. 557.

<sup>3</sup> *Fab.* 30 et 241; cf. *Ov. Her.* 4. 120.

<sup>4</sup> utrique Athenis fiebant sacra Pyanepsii die octava.

<sup>5</sup> *Preller-Plew.* ii. 298.

<sup>6</sup> *Thes.* 35; cf. *Cim.* 8, *Paus.* 1. 17. 6.

<sup>7</sup> 4. 62. 3.

<sup>8</sup> vid. supra, pp. 120, 135.

sed cf. locutionem apud Suidam simillimam (s. Οὐδέν ἱερόν) . . . ἣ ὅτι οἱ καταφυγόντες εἰς αὐτὸ δοῦλοι ἄδειαν οὐκ εἶχον. eandem vero causam Thesei exsillii protulit Philostratus<sup>1</sup> quam noster : ἐπὶ τῇ ἀρχῇ τῇ ἐς τὸν νῖόν, hoc est Hippolytum, quem patris votis taurum a Neptuno inmissum interemisse notum est. neque vero quamvis absurde videatur dici illum δοτρακισμόν iam Thesei aetatibus exstitisse — quisnam ignorat illum a Clisthene esse institutum? — causa est cur antiquitatem scholio idcirco abnegemus, cum etiam Theophrastum, auctorem minime levem, eadem dicentem videamus apud Suidam. s. ἀρχὴ Σκυρία.<sup>2</sup>

scholiasta *Vesp.* 1239 Artemidoro partim fretus de Theseo atque Admeto historiam profert nusquam alibi repertam. hunc enim affirmat, laudato Phanodemo Atticarum rerum scriptore, una cum Alcestide filioque Hippaso in Atticam ad Theseum confugisse. quae codices inferiores ad eundem locum exhibent, eorum extrema verba sic suppleo ex Ps.-Apollod. : \*Αἰδὼ μαχεσάμενος Ἡρακλῆς ἀνεκόμισε).

de Cecrope prisco rege Atheniensium, qui duplicem habuisse formam fertur, primum tradit haec scholium *Vesp.* 438 : εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ φασὶ τὸν Κέκροπα διφυᾶ γεγονέναι, καὶ τὰ κάτω ὅψεως ἐσχηκέναι, quae verba cum in florilegio "Eudociae" quod fertur<sup>3</sup> proxime accedant eis quae scholium *Plut.* 773 exhibet, scholia haec manifestum est olim adstitisse coniunctim.

inferioris demum aetatis constat historicos, ut Theopompum (*FHG.* i. 307), Characem (*FHG.* iii. 639) originem Cecropis ex Aegypto deduxisse. scholium igitur ad *Plut.* 773 (= Suid. s. Κέκροψ) quod hoc tradit, proxime ex Alexandrinis pendet, qui Atthidographos rursus secuti sunt. hoc autem licet animadvertere, scholiastam eandem causam adtulisse cur Cecrops formam habuisse geminam credatur quam etiam Iohannes Antiochenus.<sup>4</sup> hunc Eudocia quoque laudavit. porro Characem, apud Eudociam memoratum, licet statuere auctorem fuisse nostro, sicut scholiastae *Il.* 18. 483; ille autem Istri Αἰγυπτίων ἀποικίας fortasse legerat. atque Istrum

<sup>1</sup> *Her.*, p. 320 (ii. 198, Kayser).

<sup>2</sup> Eust. 782; Zenob. i. 32; Diogenian. i. 30.

<sup>3</sup> Eudoc. 25. 2 (p. 411, Flach.).

<sup>4</sup> *FHG.* iv. 557.

certe de Cecropis filiabus consuluit auctor scholiastae ad *Lys.* 642<sup>1</sup> (cf. *Thesm.* 533).

de heroe Anagyro legimus (*Lys.* 67) ad verbum Ἀναγυροντιόθεν: δῆμός τις Ἀττικῆς, ἀπὸ Ἀναγύρου ἥρωος. locus hic verbis extremis suum declarat auctorem, cum Philochori iam proprium fuisse vidimus<sup>2</sup> instituta apud Athenienses ad heroas eponymos referre. illius profecto est etiam scholium *Vesp.* 1223 (= *Lys.* 58) de filiis Pandionis; deinde schol. *Pac.* 1183,<sup>3</sup> tamen per Polemonem, qui nomina conscripsit demorum Atticorum, haec in scholia fortasse defluerunt. cf. *Av.* 645: Κριὸς δῆμος τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος φυλῆς, ἀπὸ Κριοῦ τινος ὠνομασμένος. ἀναγράφει δὲ τοὺς ἐπωνύμους τῶν δῆμων καὶ φυλῶν Πολέμων. hic vero pro illo Κριὸς censeo Κριῶα legendum esse,<sup>4</sup> quamquam etiam Suidas s. Κριὸς idem vitium exhibet.

ad *Ran.* 477, haec servata: Γοργόνες Τιθράσσαι· ἀπὸ δῆμον τῆς Ἀττικῆς πονηροῦ . . . εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι ἀπὸ Τίθραντος τοῦ Πανδίωνος παιδὸς ἐπώνυμοι . . . ἄλλως (Ven.): Τιθράσιος τόπος Λιβύης, ἐνθα αἱ Γοργόνες διέτριβον. utrumque habet Suidas,<sup>5</sup> sed omisso Pandionis filii nomine, quem *Teuthrantem*, non *Tithrantem*, vocat Steph. Byz. s. Θέσπεια.<sup>6</sup>

de Progne illius filia (schol. *Av.* 368) hoc dicendum est, fabulam ita nostrum tradidisse ut eam in lusciniam (εἰς ἀηδόνα), sororem autem Philomelam in hirundinem (εἰς χελιδόνα) versas esse fecerit (*Av.* 203, 212), quae antiquior est narratio.<sup>7</sup> hanc autem fabulam temporibus iam antiquis turbatam esse grammatici in schol. Hes. *Opp.* 568 veteres docent, ubi quaeritur utrum illo Πανδίωνις χελιδῶν Prognem an Philomelam significetur. sed Ps.-Apollod. (3. 14. 8), sicut noster, fabulam refert vetustiore.

<sup>1</sup> cf. *E. M.* 149. 20; Bekk. *An.* 1. 202.

<sup>2</sup> vid. supra, p. 139; schol. *Vesp.* 544, *Pac.* 145.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Stein, p. iv. adde schol. Soph. *O. C.* 1047; Suid. *Μαραθῶν*.

<sup>4</sup> Ross. *Att. Dem.* 124; Steph. B. s.v.; Harpocr. et Suid. s. *Κριῶα*.

<sup>5</sup> s. *Γοργόνες Τιθράσσαι* et *Τίθρασος*.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Eustath., p. 1875; Eudoc. i., p. 326.

<sup>7</sup> ita Sophocles in *Tereo* (schol. *Av.* 100).

## VI. — DE HEROIBUS NONNULLIS.

## 'Αχιλλεύς.

de Homeri Achille licet nihil narratum apud nostrum sit, fabulae a poetis post Homerum tractatae interdum memorantur (*Ran.* 911, 963, *Nub.* 922).

Thetidem eum immortalem facturam cohibuisse Pelea tradit scholiasta *Nub.* 1068: φασιν ὅτι τοὺς γενομένους παῖδας ἐκ τοῦ Πηλέως ἡ Θέτις λαμβάνουσα περιέκαιε τὸ θνητὸν αὐτῶν σῶμα, βουλομένη αὐτοὺς θανάτους ποιεῖν· καὶ πολλοὺς ἔκανσε. καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα οὖν τεκοῦσα ἐπέθηκεν εἰς τὸ πῦρ. καὶ γνοὺς ὁ Πηλεὺς ἐβόησεν. ἡ δὲ λυπηθεῖσα ἐχωρίσθη. his non convenit noster cum schol. Ap. Rh. (4. 816), qui pueros in aquam calidam dicit eam mersisse, atque id quidem non ut immortales eos faceret, sed ut cognosceret num immortales essent. sed noster ut opinor et schol. *Il.* 16. 37 ex eodem fonte hauserunt. hic autem addit: ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Λυκόφρονι.<sup>1</sup> cum utroque denique conspirat Ps.-Apollod. (3. 13. 6), qui tamen adicit Thetidem ambrosia interdiu unxisse filium.

## Πηλεὺς.

de Peleo exstat in *Nub.* 1063 scholium notabile iam a viris doctis tractatum, quod ut magis perspicue dissererem, in duas partes litteris A et B signatas divisi.

A. — haec sunt in Rav. Ven. aliisque codicibus servata (Πηλεὺς Φῶκον . . . ἐκζητήσας δίδωσιν αὐτῷ), quae ad verbum paucis tantum levioribus omissis e Ps.-Apollod. 3. 13. 1-3 exscripta sunt. Phocum a Peleo et Telamone interfectum primus, ut e schol. Eur. *Andr.* 687 apparet, narravit scriptor *Alcmeonidis*. Acasti uxor appellatur Astydamia, cum Pindarus Hippolyten, scholiasta Ap. Rh. Crethida eam vocet.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> cave tamen putes Tzetzam haec scripsisse. vid. eum ad Lyc. 178.

<sup>2</sup> Pind. *Nem.* 5. 26; schol. Ap. Rh. 1. 224: hic autem male intellexit Pindarum; cf. schol. ad loc. Suid. s. Ἀταλάντη hanc uxorem memorat Acasti.

B. — haec sunt deinde quae codices tantum inferiores exhibent (ὅτι ἀφῆκεν . . . ἔφυγε τὸν κίνδυνον). in hac quidem parte plurimum valuisse videmus Pindarum: id quod non ex illa Hippolytae mentione solum apparet, sed etiam Vulcani. cf. *Nem.* 4. 59. sed Didymi etiam manum deprehendimus in proverbii Πηλέως μάχαιρα<sup>1</sup> et μέγα φρονεῖ.<sup>2</sup> quin etiam Zenobius suorum originem a Didymi commentariis Pindaricis indicat his verbis: μέμνηται ταύτης — hoc est, τῆς μαχάρας — Ἀνακρέων καὶ Πίνδαρος ἐν Νεμεονικαῖς· φασὶ δὲ αὐτὴν ὑπὸ Ἡφαίστου γενομένην δῶρον Πηλεῖ σωφροσύνης ἕνεκα παρὰ θεῶν δοθῆναι, κτλ. hanc igitur scholii partem, quam B littera notavi, e commentariis maioribus in Pindarum a Didymo compositis huc credo illatam,<sup>3</sup> illam autem nota A indicatam a Symmacho vel ab alio quodam qui post aetatem ubi Apollodori liber compositus sit floruerit confectam esse.

#### Αἴας ὁ Τελαμῶνος.

aliis quidem poematibus cyclicis quae vocantur atque Iliade minore quae fertur Leschae raro usus est scholiasta (*Lys.* 155), quippe qui tragicos semper proximos ante oculos haberet. fabulam iucundam de certamine super Achillis cadavere a Graecis Troianisque facto e Leschae poemate narravit (*Eg.* 1056), ubi in eo a schol. *Od.* 5. 310<sup>4</sup> discrepat quod non Aiacem, sed Ulixem pugnasse dicit Troianos a corpore avertentem, illum autem corpus devexisse hoc defendente.

#### Αἴας ὁ Ὀϊλέως.

de Aiace Oilei filio fabulam attulit Sophoclis (*Frag.* 10 N) scholiasta *Av.* 933, qui tamen nihil ad rem amplius contulit quam quod e Pausania in Phocicis<sup>5</sup> iam cognitum est.

<sup>1</sup> Suid. Hes. Phot. s.v.; Eust. 1101. 63.

<sup>2</sup> Suid. s.v.; Zenob. 5. 20.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Sittl. *Gr. Litt.* iii. 472, adn. 2.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Quint. Smyrn. 3. 217.

<sup>5</sup> 10. 27. 2; cf. Welck. *Ep. Cycl.* 2. 246.



## 'Αθάμας.

item ex eiusdem *Athamante* sumpta sunt quae adscripta ad *Nub.* 257 invenimus.<sup>1</sup> neque vero ulla est mentio seminum tostorum quibus Ino sterilitatem terrae fraudulente effecit, id quod nostrum ab auctore Ps.-Apollodori (1. 9. 1) et Diodori (4. 47) communi prorsus separat. neque cum Apollodoro ipso, quem ante oculos habuisse videtur Tzetta in Lyc. 175 convenit noster, quod hic in Colchidem pervenientem Phrixum Mercurio aut Marti dicit arietem immolasse, ille autem Φυξίψ Διί.

videndum hoc quoque est, ne Sophoclis quidem fabulam cognovisse Ravennatis<sup>2</sup> scholiastam, qui nihil de Athamante poenas ob Phrixi et Helles interitum daturum audisset; nam Strepsiadem censet propter inscitiam exclamare οἱμοὶ Σώκρατες, ὥσπερ με τὸν 'Αθάμανθ' ὅπως μὴ θύσετε, de quo, ὡς ἄγροικος, inquit, 'Αθάμαντα εἶπεν ἀντὶ Φρίξου. . . ἀγνοῶν τὰς ἱστορίας· οὐ γὰρ 'Αθάμας ἐτύθη, ἀλλ' ὁ Φρίξος. sed rectius, ut iam indicavi, scholium in aliis codicibus sic interpretatur: ἐν 'Αθάμαντι Σοφοκλέους ὑπόκειται 'Αθάμας στεφανηφορῶν ὥσπερ ἱερεῖον, δίκας εἰσπραττόμενος περὶ Φρίξου.

ex Euripide item fabula Inus Phrixique cognita est (schol. *Vesp.* 1413, 1414, *Ran.* 1082<sup>3</sup>), sicut Palamedis (*Thesm.* 771). ex eodem porro desumpta quae narrantur de incestu Macarei et Canaces in scholio ad *Nub.* 1371. cf. schol. *Ran.* 849, quod ad Alexandrinos iam rettuli.<sup>4</sup> notabilis est etiam scriptura nominis Καναχή, quam alibi nisi apud schol. Plat. *Legg.* 838 C non inveni. nam Κανακή vel Κανάκη ab eis scribitur qui Ps.-Apollodorum (1. 7. 3) Diodorumque (5. 61) ediderunt. itaque hi auctores diversos, ut videtur, fontes adierunt.

pauca de Medea et Iasone adferuntur. verbis singulis hic illic mutatis dum repetit Argumentum Eur. *Medeae* (*Eq.* 1321) scholiasta, eam narrat redintegrasse et refecisse Aeschlylo auctore Bacchi nutrices, Aesonem secundum scriptorem *Nostorum*, Iasonem quoque

<sup>1</sup> exscripta etiam a Zenob. 4. 38, Apostol. 11. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Martin, p. 34.

<sup>3</sup> Welck. *Gr. Trag.* i. 317. vid. Athen. 13, p. 560 D.

<sup>4</sup> supra, p. 142.

testibus Pherecyde (*Frag.* 74) et Simonide (*Frag.* 204). tum eam per Thessaliam una cum Iasone fugientem dicit herbas dispersisse, unde Thessaliam propter venena ac sagas in mala fama fuisse (*Nub.* 749); quam fabulam a Diodoro praetermissam<sup>1</sup> et a Lucano ignoratam<sup>2</sup> apud Aristidem<sup>3</sup> rhetorem solum repperi. postremo haec dicitur filium ex Aegeo peperisse Medum (*Pac.* 289), contra Hesiodum (*Theog.* 1001), qui Medae atque Iasonis filium Medeum memorat. hac quidem re non cum Ps.-Apollodoro (1. 9. 28) solum convenit noster, veram etiam cum Eustathio in Dionys. P. 1017, ut auctorem omnium non liceat discernere.

### Οἰνεύς.

ac de Euripide, non de rerum scriptoribus fabularium ea pendent quae de Oeneo breviter dicuntur *Ach.* 418. differt enim Ps.-Apollodorus (1. 8. 3) ab Euripide, quod ille scriptorem *Alcmeonidis* Pherecydemque secutus praecipue, causis primo propter quas Oeneus in exsilium relegatus sit alienis adlatis, dicit porro Diomedem Agrii filiis interfectis non Oeneo quidem regnum reddidisse, id quod finxit Euripides, sed eius genero Andraemoni; ipsum autem in Peloponnesum deduxisse. rursus autem de Meleagro Oenei filio narratio codd. inferioribus servata (*Ran.* 1238) ex Apollodoro (1. 8. 2) derivata est: ita tamen ut proxime ex ampliore scholio, a Zenobio (5. 33) exscripto, defluerit.

inepte quidem fabulam Atalantae, quae Melanioni proco usque recusasse nuptias fertur, tangit schol. *Lys.* 785: μήποτε ('fortasse')<sup>4</sup> παρὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν εἴρηκεν. οὐ γὰρ Μελανίων ἔφευγε μᾶλλον (h.e. conubium reiciebat), ἀλλ' ἡ Ἀταλάντη. sed poeta de Atalanta non cogitabat. nimis doctus igitur est Didymus, qui porro formam epicam Μελανίων versui Aristophanis non convenientem exhibet pro illo Μελανίων.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Diod. 4. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Lucan. *de Bell. Civ.* 6. 438.

<sup>3</sup> i., p. 76, Dind.

<sup>4</sup> hoc verbum est Didymi; M. Schmidt, p. 212.

<sup>5</sup> Ps.-Apollod. 3. 9. 2. vid. Dind. ad schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 150.

## Τήλεφος.

mirum id sane est, quod quamvis comicus persaepe Telephi Euripidei dolores ludibrio habuerit, in scholiis tamen de illo Mysorum rege vix quidquam prolatum. quae legimus ad *Ran.* 842 (cf. Acusilaum ap. schol. *Od.* 11. 520) in codd. inferioribus, ea e Tzetta (in *Lyc.* 211) in brevius redacta. ille autem schol. *Il.* 1. 59 (cf. schol. *Pind.* *O.* 9. 107) videtur expilasse.

neque plura de aliis fabulis post Homerum relatis contulit noster. nequam plane est scholium recens *Nub.* 622, quod non Sarpedona solum verum etiam Memnona Iovis filium memoraverit. Tithonum in cicadam versum tradit schol. *Ach.* 688, cuius fabulae auctor unus erat Clearchus ἐν τῷ περὶ βίων.<sup>1</sup>

ab ipso Homero reliqua pendentia quae nondum commemoravi haec sunt.

fideliter poetam secutus nonnulla de Ulixē narrat *Vesp.* 179 et *Plut.* 312. Lamum quoque poeta iterum auctore (*Od.* 10. 85)<sup>2</sup> urbem Laestrygonum memorat, *Pac.* 758; sed eorum insulam, quoniam poeta statim post illos Circen commemoravit (*Od.* 10. 135 seqq.) haec incoluisse false dicitur *Plut.* 303, in scholio recentiore. recte tradit comites Ulixis omnes in porcos versos esse, cum Apollodorus,<sup>3</sup> locis Homeri *Od.* 10. 212 et 238 confusis, eos non porcos solum, sed etiam lupos asinos leones dicat factos esse.

praeterea hoc loco licet animadvertere, de amoribus Cyclopis et Galataeae, a poetis recentioribus narratis, Philoxenum dithyrambicum laudatum esse a scholiasta *Plut.* 290.<sup>4</sup>

## Κάστωρ. Πολυδεύκης.

Ut Athenis usitato more Ceres Liberaque vel maxime τὸ θεῶ (schol. *Pac.* 214), simillime etiam Castor et Pollux di Lacedaemonii patrii (schol. *ibid.*) τὸ σιῶ praecipue vocabantur.

<sup>1</sup> Zenob. 6. 18.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Hesych. s. Λάμος.

<sup>3</sup> vid. *Frag. Sabbait. Mus. Rhén.* xlv. 161.

<sup>4</sup> Suid. Θρητταυλό. Bergk. *PLG.* iii. 609.

Aptissimum ad perspicendum quatenus noster horum scientiam herorum consecutus sit scholium est *Av.* 695: ὑπηνέμια (h.e. ova urina) καλεῖται τὰ δίχα συνουσίας καὶ μίξεως· καὶ τοῦτο δὲ οὐχ ὥς ἐτυχεν αὐτῷ προσέρριπται, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ ἱστορίας τῆς κατὰ τοὺς Διοσκούρους. φασὶ γὰρ ἐξ ψοῦ αὐτοὺς γεγονέναι. καὶ (παρατηρητέον scilicet) ὅτι σύνηθες αὐτοῖς (lege Ἀττικοῖς) μᾶλλον ἀνεμαῖον λέγειν. verba poetae, id quod supra monui,<sup>1</sup> male intellexit scholiasta cum cogitaret de ovo quod Leda Iovis semine gravida peperit. hic enim non solum Hesiodum Pindarumque, verum etiam Cypriorum poetam ignorare videtur,<sup>2</sup> quorum auctor<sup>3</sup> solam Helenam, de qua, apud Euripidem saepius commemoratam,<sup>4</sup> noster silet, ex ovo partam esse tradiderat. quare paret narrationem de Castoribus quoque ex illo ovo ortis longo post tempore fictam esse, ut quidem adfirmat scholiasta *Od.* 11. 298, quod ferme repetit Tzetz. Lyc. 88. recentioris igitur grammatici Alexandrini nostrum scholium est, qui, ut Didymus, id floruerit temporis cum illa fabula a poetis maxime Romanis pervulgata esset.<sup>5</sup>

de fratribus Lynceo Idaque quibuscum Castores certaverunt scholium exstat bene instructum *Plut.* 210:<sup>6</sup> ὁ ξύτερον τοῦ Λυγκέως· τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ἴδα, ὡς δ' αὐτὸς ἐν Δαναΐσι φησίν, υἱὸς Αἰγύπτου. ἐροῦμεν δ' ἐκεῖ τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ· ἐπεὶ δοκεῖ παρ' ἱστορίαν λέγειν. τοσοῦτον δὲ ὀξύωπιστάτος ἦν ὡς καὶ δι' ἐλάτης ἰδεῖν Καστορα δολοφονήσαντα τὸν ἀδελφόν, ὡς φησι Πίνδαρος (*Nem.* 10. 115). haec Didymi commentariis rursus<sup>7</sup> Pindaricis extracta esse perspicitur, nam is lectores saepius aliam in partem scholiorum ut supra (ἐροῦμεν . . . αὐτοῦ) solebat referre.<sup>8</sup> poetae quidem, qui Lyncea dixerat filium esse Aegypti, discrepantia in eo consistere videtur quod illi Lynceo, qui oculorum acumine omnes antecedeat, non Aegyptus, sed Aphareus pater fuit.<sup>9</sup> quod cum aperte expositum esse in alio Veneti scholio ad hunc

<sup>1</sup> p. 85. Luc. *de sacrif.* 6 rectius utitur verbo cum Vulcanum per iocum dicit ὑπηνέμιον, Hes. *Theog.* 927-928 recordatus.

<sup>2</sup> schol. Pind. *Nem.* 10. 150; Clem. Al. *Protr.*, p. 26, Potter.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Athen. 8. 334 c.

<sup>4</sup> *Hel.* 17, 21 et saepe, *J. A.* 794, *Or.* 1387 et schol.

<sup>5</sup> Hor. *S.* 2. 1. 26, *A. P.* 147; Ov. *M.* 6. 538.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Suid. Λυγκέως, Λυγκέως ὁ ξύτερον, Palaeph. 10.

<sup>7</sup> supra, p. 146.

<sup>8</sup> Boeckh. *Pind. praef.*, p. xvii.

<sup>9</sup> cf. Bergler ap. Blaydes. *Frag.* 259 *Danaidum*.

locum videamus, hoc potest e commentariis *Danaidum* sumptum esse.

nunc in cod. Rav. (sicut in Ven.) Lynceus dicitur Castorem potuisse videre fratri suo insidiantem atque hunc interficientem. manifesto igitur patet in loco Pindari adlato nostrum quidem legisse ἤμενον de uno solo fratre dictum, non ἡμένος (ἡμένους Boeckh). at illud ἤμενον secundum Mommsenium lectio fuit Didymi, si quidem recte intellexit vir summus scholium de quo iam multi disputarunt.<sup>1</sup> confer sis cum nostro Didymi verba in parte illius scholii Pindarici integra servata: ἀμφοτέρων ὑπὸ τῇ δρυνὶ λαχόντων, τοῦ τε Κάστορος καὶ τοῦ Πολυδεύκου, μόνον ὁ Λυγκεὺς τὸν Κάστορα εἶδε.<sup>2</sup>

notabile vero mihi quidem videtur scholium *Plut.* 845 recentius quod cum Herculem mysteriis Cereris initiatum tradit continuo addit: ὅπερ δὲ πρὸς Ἡρακλέα, τοῦτο καὶ πρὸς Διοσκόρους ἐποίησαν. eodem enim modo et Herculem et Dioscuros commemorat Xenophon,<sup>3</sup> quorum etiam coniunctim iterum fecit mentionem Plutarchus,<sup>4</sup> qui autem a Xenophonte differt, quod eos antea in civitatem adoptari et recipi coactos esse dicit:<sup>5</sup> quod vero iam supra ad Istrum referre conatus sum.<sup>6</sup> causas vero a Plutarcho adlatas cur Castores digni habiti sint qui initiarentur, videlicet quod beneficia Atticis multa contulissent eosque servassent, easdem de Hercule, ut supra vidimus, noster memoravit.

iam e verbis Plutarchi (*Thes.* 33) apparet Athenienses quoque heroas Castorem et Pollucem, quos Ἄνακας vocabant, religiose coluisse. nunc de his geniis, qui domuum defensores quoque habebantur,<sup>7</sup> quaerendum est (quoniam Vesta foco praefecta, Mercurius *Στροφαῖος* atque Apollo Ἄγνιεύς foribus, Iuppiter autem Ἐρκείος parietibus), quae domicilii pars in eorum fuerit tutela. huc autem pertinere puto scholium (*Nub.* 1006), ubi Castores dicuntur

<sup>1</sup> vide sententias virorum doctorum valde diversas ab Abelio conlatas, pp. 314-323.

<sup>2</sup> atque e nostro apparet M. Schmidium pro εἶδε perperam coniecisse ἀπέλε.

<sup>3</sup> *Hell.* 6. 3. 6; cf. Aristid. i., p. 607, Dind.

<sup>4</sup> *Thes.* 33.

<sup>5</sup> pari ratione Anacharsis primum civis factus tum demum a Solone initiatum est. Theoxen. ap. Luc. *Scyth.* 8; cf. Jul. *or.* 7. 288 B.

<sup>6</sup> p. 139.

<sup>7</sup> vid. Deneken ap. Rosch. 3. *Heros*, p. 2516.

harundinibus coronati esse: ἦν δὲ τῶν Διοσκούρων ἴδιον στεφανοῦσθαι καλᾶμψ. propriae sane eorum harundines praecipue erant, quippe quae in ripis Eurotae fluminis Lacedaemonii florebant.<sup>1</sup> sed nonnullis in locis casae stramentis tegebantur,<sup>2</sup> neque absurdum est Athenis quoque, ubi domicilia privata sordida atque ignobilia fuisse notum est,<sup>3</sup> tecta putare nonnunquam more pristino strata esse calamis. ego idcirco conligo Castores antiquitus tectorum praesides habitos. quae si recte exposui, utilia vero sunt ad titulum Atticum inlustrandum admodum obscurum, qui est: Ἱερέως Ἀνάκων καὶ ἥρωος ἐπιτεγίου.<sup>4</sup> quae inscriptio adhuc ideo inexplicabilis quia nemo, ni fallor, Castorem et Pollucem vidit fuisse tecti potissimum defensores.<sup>5</sup>

#### Ἀσκληπιός.

fabula de Aesculapio a scholiasta nulla narrata est: ad cultum nonnulla pertinentia *Pluti* potissimum scholia, quod expectandum erat, servant. quoniam vero templa dei in Piraeo et Aegina sita (schol. *Plut.* 621, *Vesp.* 123) memoravit, mirum quidem videtur quod omnino nihil de illo Epidauri celeberrimo delubro dicitur. locus autem est (*Plut.* 690) quo angues Aesculapi sacri commemorantur, ex Alexandrinis, ut M. Schmidtius vidit,<sup>6</sup> ductus: μέμνηται δὲ αὐτοῦ (anguis) καὶ Δημοσθένης. Ven.: καὶ Λυκούργος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Δημάδου λόγος. ἔστι δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτον εἶδος καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ. haec in Ven. addita haud integra videntur esse servata, cum Harpocraton<sup>7</sup> hanc in Demadem orationem tradat scripsisse non Lycurgum, sed Hyperidem.<sup>8</sup> atque tanto magis in suspicione versatur id quod in Ven. accedit, quia etiam infra post illa τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον εἶδος εὐρίσκεται ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς, adiecit ille codex τοῦ Διονυσίου, quod prorsus ineptum est. Aesculapi coronae commemorantur *Plut.* 686: στεφανηφόρος

<sup>1</sup> cf. Eur. *I. T.* 399.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Herod. 5. 101.

<sup>3</sup> vid. Dicaearch., p. 8, Fuhr.

<sup>4</sup> *CIA.* iii. 290.

<sup>5</sup> vid. Rosch., p. 2516; cf. P. Gardner, *New Chapters*, p. 352, fin.

<sup>6</sup> p. 299.

<sup>7</sup> Harp. (= Suid. Phot.) s. παρεῖται δφεις.

<sup>8</sup> Lycurgi tamen orationem κατὰ Δημάδου memorat etiam Suid. s. Λυκούργος.

γὰρ ὁ Ἀσκληπιδὲς δὲ στενάζων. ὑγείας γὰρ ἔστιν ἔφορος. ceterum verbum στενάζων certe corruptum est. licet e codd. inferioribus ad 685 corrigere hoc modo: δὲ στεφάνους ἔχων. cum vero coronae non modo in eius honorem gratiarumque causa reddendarum vovebantur, sed etiam propterea quod hilaritatem<sup>1</sup> et sanitatem significabant, recte sane deinde pergit illis: ὑγείας γὰρ ἔστιν ἔφορος.

ortum Aesculapi ex Apolline et Arsinoe vel Coronide nusquam memorat noster; memorat tamen eius liberos, cum Podalirium Machaonemque, quos etiam Homerus noverat, tum ceteros in cultum Atticum receptos, Iaso, Panaceam, Hygieam, quorum nominibus medicina salusque per quandam significationem indicabantur, ut recte dixit schol. *Plut.* 639, cf. 701. In cod. Rav. Iaso sine ulla exceptione dicitur esse Aesculapii filia. atqui in Ven. (cf. Hesych. Ἰασώ) et Amphiarai filia nuncupatur, auctore ipso poeta (*Frag.* 35, Blaydes.). tamen ex ipso scholiasta Hesychioque apparet eam haud usitato more filiam huius acceptam esse, ut valde probabile sit scholiastam verum poetae quem laudat secus intellexisse.<sup>2</sup> Pausanias saltem (1. 34. 2), dum Amphiarai templum Oropium describit, Panaceam Iaso Hygieam filias eius esse non dicit, sed habuisse statuas prope eius aram sicut Venerem et Minervam Paeoniam.

praeter illos quinque liberos nominantur etiam Aegle,<sup>3</sup> Ianiscus, qui originem ex Attica duxisse videtur,<sup>4</sup> Alexenor, qui Titanae potissimum in urbe Secyonia colebatur.<sup>5</sup>

scholiasta autem quamquam adeo cum ceteris auctoribus convenit ut nomina Aesculapi liberorum prope eadem tradat,<sup>6</sup> de uxore tamen auctorem unicum Hermippum<sup>7</sup> ab aliis dissidentem laudat, qui ipse certe suo marte Lampetiam Solis filiam illius uxorem finxit. sed Epione a plerisque<sup>8</sup> eius fertur consors, quod nomen in religione dei arbitror esse usitatissimum, quia ipsius appellationi antiquissimae,

<sup>1</sup> nam laurea, non myrtea coronabatur; Fest. s. in insula.

<sup>2</sup> verum e tragoedia aliqua excerptum vidit Bakhuijsen.

<sup>3</sup> Aristid. i., p. 79, Dind.; Suid. s. Ἐγλέη; *E. M.* 434. 15.

<sup>4</sup> Paus. 2. 6. 3.

<sup>5</sup> ib. 2. 23. 4.

<sup>6</sup> omissis sane Aceso a Suid. Ἐπιδόρη, Telesphoro a Paus. 2. 11. 7 commemoratis.

<sup>7</sup> *Frag.* 73, i. 247 K.

<sup>8</sup> Suid. s.v.; *E. M.* 434. 15; schol. *Il.* 4. 195; schol. Aristid. l.c.; Paus. 2. 29. 1. Paus. tamen et schol. *Il.* alia cognoverant nomina, ut docent illa κατὰ τινὰς et φασίς.

quae fuit Ἥπιος<sup>1</sup> quodam modo respondet. sed poetae, ut solent, prorsus illius familiae nomina fabulasque libera manu conturbarunt.<sup>2</sup>

### Τροφώνιος.

Trophonius heros fuit ingenio Aesculapii simillimus, de cuius oraculo ab aegrotis consulto scholium extat notabile *Nub.* 508 maxima cum cura studioque a viris eruditis iam tractatum.<sup>3</sup> in cod. Rav. traditur fuisse oraculum Lebadiae in Boeotia Καταβάσιον vocatum, in recessu quodam cavoque admodum angusto situm, quo illi per aliquot dies lustrati sacrisque amicti vestimentis irent, cum libis mellitis quibus angues placarent: οὕτω καθίζουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ στόμιον καὶ αἰφνίδιον ἀρπάζονται<sup>4</sup> καὶ καταδύνουσιν<sup>5</sup> ὑπὸ τῆς γῆς, κτλ. sed numina Trophonii atque Iovis Καταιβάτον<sup>6</sup> coniungenda esse monet etiam illud Καταβάσιον quod modo memoravi. huius autem Iovis Atticum saltem cultum cognovisse vidimus Apollodorum, Strabonis in libris viii-x auctorem. hinc ipso Strabone (9. p. 414) conlato, qui eadem de re sic disputat: Λεβάδεια δ' ἐστὶν ὅπου Διὸς Τροφωνίου μαντεῖον ἴδρυνται, χάσματος ὑπονόμου κατάβασιν ἔχον, καταβαίνει δ' αὐτὸς ὁ χρηστηριαζόμενος, non possum equidem quin scholium Ravennatis inter Apollodorea reponam.

agitur autem hic praecipue de fabula quam Charax ἐν τῷ δ' de Trophonio atque Agamede narravit apud scholiastam (cod. Ven): regem Stympthalium Agamedem uxorem duxisse Epicastam; huius fuisse filium spurium Trophonium;<sup>7</sup> artifices callidissimos templum Apollinis Delphici vetustissimum aedificavisse;<sup>8</sup> atque Augeae cum

<sup>1</sup> *E. M.* 434. 15.

<sup>2</sup> cf. schol. *Il.* 4. 195 (*Hes. Frag.* 113, Rzach).

<sup>3</sup> Müll. *Orch.* i. 88; Buttm. *Myth.* 2. 227; Welck. *Ep. Cycl.* 2. 304.

<sup>4</sup> ego scripsi. R. ἀρπάζουσι, Suid. ἡρπάζοντο.

<sup>5</sup> R. (vid. Martin.); Suid. κατέδυον, καταδύνουσιν alii.

<sup>6</sup> cf. supra, p. 124. Prellerus<sup>3</sup> ii. 478, 479, Mercurio καταιβάτη Trophonium adsimulat; sed Iovem καταιβάτην plane hic praetermittit. pueros in Trophonii cultu servitores Ἐρμῆς nominat Paus. 9. 39. 4.

<sup>7</sup> ἦς παῖς ἦν Τ. σκότιος, verbum alias quidem prorsa oratione vix scriptum, quo indicio fontem videas Characis *Telegoniam* quam scripsit Eugamio epicus.

<sup>8</sup> h. Hom. in *Apoll.* 118 (296).



aerarium exstruxissent lapidem reliquisse mobilem, quo noctu ineuntes furto pecuniam regi subriperent una cum Cercyone Agamedis et Epicastae filio legitimo; quod cum animadvertisset, fures tamen reprehendere non posset, Augeam vehementer animo perturbatum Daedalum e Creta Minoem fugientem atque in Elidem profectum in auxilium ut illos deprenderet vocasse; a quo plagis in aerario positus incidisse Agamedem, cui, ne reus cognosceretur, caput abscidisse Trophonium atque fuga in Boeotiam profectum fecisse sibi aedes subterraneas.

miram quam habet haec fabula similitudinem illius historiae ab Herodoto<sup>1</sup> de Rhampsinito Aegyptiorum rege traditae iam satis notatam me non oportet demonstrare. iam vero in Eugammonis *Telegonia* censet Welckerus<sup>2</sup> narratum esse de aerario Augeae, de furto Agamedis eiusque filiarum, de Daedali dolo, de capite amputato. certum est rectius iudicasse Buttmannum,<sup>3</sup> qui hanc perantiquam putabat fabellam ex Oriente una ex parte in Aegyptum, altera autem in Graeciam seorsum pervulgatam esse, quam Valckenarium, qui Herodotum historiam in Graecos omnium primum intulisse credebat. sed neque Herodotus neque Charax auctor est unicus: nam quo modo fabulae populares vagentur et alii docuerunt atque vir his quidem rebus versutissimus Andreas Lang.<sup>4</sup> neque scilicet quisquam hodie ultro dicat religionem Trophonii ex Aegypto translatam esse. immo ipse Charax de fabula Aegyptia nihil suspicari videtur, qui, si eam novisset, haud dubie utpote homo rebus Aegyptiis instructus — id quod de Cecrope quaerentes supra vidimus<sup>5</sup> — Herodotum vel alium quemvis rerum Aegyptiarum studiosum secutus illam de Rhampsinito, non de Trophonio, narrasset.

quidam, ut in cod. Ven. deinde fertur, Trophonium Cercyonemque dixerant esse filios Epicastae atque Apollinis, qui etiam Aesculapii pater fuit, id quod in *Telegonia* sane narrari potuisset; alii autem Iovis

<sup>1</sup> 2. 121; cf. Diod. 1. 62.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep. Cycl.* ii. 306.

<sup>3</sup> *Myth.* ii. 228.

<sup>4</sup> *Custom and Myth*, Introd. [sed maxime conferenda quae de hac fabula composuit L. H. Elwell in *A Tale of Thievery*, Amherst, 1890, et in *Proceedings of the Amer. Philol. Assoc.* 1890, p. xxv. — F. D. A.]

<sup>5</sup> p. 143.

et Iocastae, quod veri simile est, ut opinor, apud Thebanos pervolgatum et in *Oedipodia* repetitum esse; alii quoque, eum secuti qui carmen in Apollinem Homericum<sup>1</sup> contexit, Trophonium fecerunt Ergini filium. atque in Ven. legimus illi e Stympphalo Lebadiam fugienti terram dehiscere, quod de Amphiarao quoque fertur.<sup>2</sup> cum Veneti narratione aliis quidem rebus convenit Pausanias<sup>3</sup> atque in eo, quod eos qui sortes apud deum poscerent ex antro dicit emissos esse eodem ore quo intrassent: πολλοὶ μὲν, inquit, αὐθημερὸν ἀνεπέμφθησαν δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ στομίου (lege διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στομίου), cum codices inferiores sic tradant: δι' ἄλλου στόματος ἀναρριπτοῦνται.

in proverbium venerat illud ἐς Τροφωνίου μεμάντεται de eis dictum qui numquam ridebant: ὁ δὲ εἰσιὼν ἐκείνῃ λοιπὸν οὐκέτι ἐγέλα διὰ τὴν τῶν ὄψεων ἐκπληξιν. ὅθεν καὶ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγελάστων καὶ συνωφρυνμένων, ἐς Τροφωνίου μεμάντεται. scholium hoc in recentioribus codicibus exstans inter Didymi proverbia reponendum est, quia et apud paroemiographos et apud Athenaeum similia exponuntur.<sup>4</sup>

#### VII.—DE HECATE CULTUQUE MORTUORUM.

ob studium quod nuper a viris doctis ad res obscuriores caerimoniasque abditiores intellegendas quae ad religionem ac superstitiones Graecorum pertinent maxima cum voluntate atque optimo eventu applicatum est, magni sane refert eorum habere rationem quae de Hecate scholiasta profert. parum enim adhuc est quaesitum de sacris tristibus et arcanis quae ad deos inferos maiores, ut Cererem Proserpinam Ditem Iacchum, atque heroas manesque piandos sedule fiebant; quibus praeterea religionem Graecorum elucet non tam hilarem fuisse neque sacra semper tam laetis ritibus celebrata esse quam vulgo creditum est. quod ut demonstrum pauca habeo quae dicam, dum omnia quae noster contulit congero.

dea igitur Hecate cum nusquam appellata sit apud nostrum *τριοδίτης*, tamen praeses triviorum et viarum nota est: ad eius statuas

<sup>1</sup> v. 119 (297).

<sup>2</sup> Pind. *O.* 6. 14, *N.* 9. 24, 10. 8.

<sup>3</sup> 9. 39. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Diogenian. 1. 8; Athen. 14. 614 A.

in triviis positas dedicabant divites cibum nova luna<sup>1</sup> quem comedebant pauperes (schol. *Plut.* 594). statuis vero his ubique positis, omnia respicit et tuetur, *Vesp.* 804: Ἐκάταιον· ἱερὸν Ἐκάτης, ὡς τῶν Ἀθηναίων πανταχοῦ ἰδρυομένων αὐτὴν ὡς ἔφορον πάντων καὶ κουροτρόφον. Ἐκάταιον οὖν Ἐκάτης ἄγαλμα, τὸ Ἐκατήσιον λεγόμενον. τῇ προσφθίᾳ Καλλίστρατος ὡς ἐπινίκιον. ἐν τισὶ γὰρ εὐρηγαι Ἐκατεῖον (an Ἐκαταῖον?). at cur tandem ea coniunctim et ἔφορος πάντων et κουροτρόφος memoratur? quorum nominum hoc pariter de Cerere Vestaque, illud de Mercurio atque Apolline Agyieo dici solebat. mihi quidem hoc persuasum, κουροτρόφον<sup>2</sup> eam appellatam esse ut quae pueros in viis praecipue ludentes tueatur; praeterea si non supervacaneum quidem esse videtur munera officiaque dearum Cereris Vestae Hecates, quae omnes aliquando κουροτρόφοι appellabantur, discernere ac definire, haec arbitror statuere licere: Cererem sicut Tellurem in universum dictam esse κουροτρόφον, quae omnibus hominibus et maxime pueris vitam suppeditaret; Vestam autem inde hoc nomine nuncupatam, quod ad focum huic numini sanctum pueris nomen rite daretur; denique Hecaten ita esse appellatam, cum pueros semper ante oculos haberet et defenderet.

Didymi certe est explanatio qua ἐκάταια esse dicuntur Hecates effigies, quam etiam habet Hesychius.<sup>3</sup> etenim Callistratus de accentu tantum verbi adfertur. ea autem non modo imagines, sed etiam ritus quosdam quibus Hecate et manes interfuerunt significare videntur (*Ran.* 366),<sup>4</sup> cum illud poetae τῶν ἐκαταίων in Rav. et Ven. sic exponitur: τῶν τῆς Ἐκάτης μυστηρίων. quae autem ad haec sacra attinent ea esse arbitror Apollodorea, cum iam Steinius<sup>5</sup> omnia monuit de Curetibus et Corybantibus quae servavit scholiasta ex illo translata esse. itaque in hoc scholiorum genus revocandum est schol. *Pac.* 277 ubi cum Corybantium tum Hecates commemorantur sacra in Samothracia celebrata. totum ferme scholium adfero:<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> cur in triviis colatur Hecate sic in Ven. explicatur: διὰ τὸ αὐτὴν Σελήνην καὶ Ἄρτεμιν καὶ Ἐκάτην καλεῖσθαι.

<sup>2</sup> Hes. *Theog.* 450, 452; similia de Artemide profert Diod. 5, 73.

<sup>3</sup> s. ἐκάταια.

<sup>4</sup> Suid. s. κατατλή; cf. Bekk. *An.* 1. 247: ἐκαταῖα (ita) τὰ τῇ Ἐκάτῃ θυόμενα, ἅπερ ἐστὶ τῶν νεκρῶν ἐναγίσματα. ἡ γὰρ Ἐκάτη ἐπὶ τῇ τιμῇ τῶν νεκρῶν ἦν.

<sup>5</sup> p. xvi.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Suid. Σαμοθράκη, Ἄλλ' εἴ τις.

ἐν Σαμοθράκῃ ἦσαν τελεταί τινες αἵ ἐδόκουν τελεῖσθαι πρὸς ἀλεξιφάρμακά τινα κινδύνων. ἐν δὲ τῇ Σαμοθράκῃ τὰ τῶν Κορυβάντων ἦν μυστήρια καὶ τὰ τῆς Ἑκάτης. καὶ διαβόητον ἦν τὸ Ζήρινθον ἄντρον, ἐνθα τὴν Ἑκάτην ὀργιάζειν ἐλέγετο, καὶ τελετὰς ἤγον αὐτῇ τινες καὶ κύνας ἔθυσον . . . ἐν κινδύνοις δὲ γενόμενοι ἐπεκαλοῦντο τοὺς δαίμονας οἱς ἐδόκουν μεμνησθαι ἐπιφανῆναι καὶ ἀλεξῆσαι. hoc scholio accuratius investigato haec statuere possumus: sacra haec in specu tenebricoso abscondita atque in Hecates honorem celebrata ad manes piandos animasque eliciendas destinabantur, ut responsis datis auxilium ferrent contra hostes aliaque pericula. nam de tali subventu ac specie dicitur proprie illud ἐπιφανῆναι in arte sagarum. qui autem hanc ex inferis opem impetrare vellent eis primo opus erat purgari, quod canibus immolatis efficiebatur, ut testatur noster una cum Plutarcho,<sup>1</sup> item imprecationibus, si quidem recte legimus apud Suidam s. Ἑκάτην: οἱ μὲν τὴν Ἀρτεμιν, οἱ δὲ τὴν σελήνην, ἐν φάσμασιν ἐκτόποις φαινομένην τοῖς καταρωμένοις. praeter canes autem alias quoque insolitas victimas his caerimoniis superstitiosi videntur immolasse: ipse enim poeta *Av.* 1556 dicit: ἐνθα καὶ Πείσανδρος ἦλθε δεόμενος ψυχὴν ἰδεῖν ἣ ζῶντ' ἐκείνων προὔλιπε, σφάγι' ἔχων κάμηλον ἀμνόν τιν', ubi scholiasta, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνακαλουμένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἐξ (*Rav. ἐν*), Ἀίδου, explicat. nonnuncquam etiam species dirae larvaeque visae sunt non vocatae, quas irata ex Orco inter cultores metu percussos Hecate emittebat,<sup>2</sup> quod eam profecto media nocte saepissime fecisse et alii docent et Suid. 5. Ταυροπόλα: τοὺς πολλοὺς γὰρ τῶν μαινομένων ἐκ σελήνης νοσεῖν ὑποτίθενται διὰ τὸ τῶν νυκτερινῶν δεσπόζειν φαντασμάτων.

nec tamen noctu solum monstra ab Hecate missa apparebant, verum etiam meridie; cf. schol. *Ran.* 293: <sup>3</sup> Ἐμπουσα τοίνυν· φάντασμα δαιμονιώδες ὑπὸ Ἑκάτης ἐπιπεμπόμενον.<sup>4</sup> καὶ οἱ μὲν φασιν αὐτὴν μονόποδα εἶναι, καὶ ἐτυμολογοῦσιν οἰονεῖ ἐνίποδα (διὰ τὸ ἐνὶ ποδὶ κεχρησθαι)· οἱ δὲ

<sup>1</sup> *De Is. et Osir.* 71, *Qu. Rom.* 68.

<sup>2</sup> schol. *Vat. Theocr.* 2. 12: ὅτι τῇ Ἑκάτῃ σκύλακας προσήγον ἐἰς θυρίαν, ἣν ὡς φασματώδη δεδοίκασι.

<sup>3</sup> Suid. s. Ἐμπουσα, quem integrum intulerat Aldus, Hesych. s.v. adde *Lex. Rhét.*, *Bekk. An.* i. 249, 27; Zonar. s.v. p. 701; Eust. in *Dionys. P.* 723, qui a Cratete Mallota omnes e schol. *Ran.* 294 pendere videntur.

<sup>4</sup> hanc a Suida servatam lectionem (contra *Rav.*, Zonar., *Lex. Rhét. πεμπόμενον*) firmat schol. *Ap. Rh.* 3. 861.

ὅτι ἐξηλλάττετο τὴν μορφήν. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ταῖς μεσημβρίαις φαντάζεσθαι, ὅταν τοῖς κατοικομένοις ἐναγίζωσιν. ἔνιοι δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν τῇ Ἑκάτῃ, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν τοῖς Ταγηνισταῖς (*Frag.* 14, 15), κτλ. nihil sane intersit utrum Empusam eandem atque Hecatē an aliam putemus esse. omnia enim ab hac inmissa Hecataea appellata esse testatur schol. Ap. Rh. 3. 861: ἐπάκεις δέ φησι καὶ τὴν Ἑκάτην ἐπικαλέσασθαι. δοκοῦσι γὰρ αἱ φαρμακίδες τὴν Ἑκάτην ἐπάγεσθαι. . . λέγεται δὲ καὶ φάσματα ἐπιπέμπειν τὰ καλούμενα Ἑκαταῖα, καὶ πολλάκις αὐτὴ μεταβάλλειν τὸ εἶδος, διὸ καὶ Ἐμπουσαν καλεῖσθαι. ex quo patet et hunc sicut nostrum scholiastam Empusam ita vocavisse quasi ἐν πάσαις μορφαῖς apparentem. ea propter pedem asinum δνόκωλος vocabatur (cf. Cratetem ap. schol. *Ran.* 294) vel δνοσκελὶς (schol. *Ecll.* 1056).

sed tempus maxime idoneum manibus sacrificando Anthesteriis fuit circa aequinoctium vernalis celebratis.<sup>1</sup> et quoniam vero Hecate in numero deorum inferorum habebatur,<sup>2</sup> horum quidem rituum eam participem fuisse una cum Mercurio et Baccho<sup>3</sup> exspectandum est. porro his feriis manes quoque ex Orco visos esse constat ex Hesychio (s. μαραι ἡμέραι), qui hos taetros horridosque fuisse dies testatur τοῦ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος μηνός, ἐν αἷς τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν κατοικομένων ἀνέειναι ἐδόκουν. quibus omnibus expensis erat olim cum pro illo μεσημβρίας conicerem ἰσημερίας. sed frustra, nam diem ipsum medium vulgo tempus horribile et taetrum creditum esse, me docuit Kittredgius praeceptor eruditissimus.<sup>4</sup>

cum autem Empusa, quae pedes habuit dispare alterum aeris alterum asini, et antiquitus et hodie cum monstro simili quae Lamia vocatur in mentibus hominum incultorum confusa sit,<sup>5</sup> haec quoque hoc loco considerata est. de Lamia enim fabula narratur schol. *Pac.* 758, *Vesp.* 1035 auctore Duride ἐν β' Λιβυκῶν. illi quidem Beli

<sup>1</sup> Theopomp. ap. schol. *Ach.* 1076, *Ran.* 218; Suid. *Χῆροι*; cf. schol. *Ach.* 961, Suid. *Χῆρ.*

<sup>2</sup> schol. Theocr. 2. 12.

<sup>3</sup> schol. *Ran.* 218, *Ach.* 1076.

<sup>4</sup> vid. B. Schmidt, *Volksleben d. Neugriechen*, pp. 94–96, p. 119, adn. 3; Frazer, *G. B.* i. 142 sq. eis quos illi de hac re adtulerunt locis adde hos a me compertos: schol. *Il.* 11. 84; *E. M.* (s. *λεπὸν ἡμαρ*); Serv. *G.* 4. 400; Hom. *Od.* 4. 450; Joh. Antioch. *FHG.* iv. 551. nec sane aliena est fabula a Diodoro (4. 22) de venatore quodam narrata.

<sup>5</sup> Philostr. *Vit. Apollon.* 4. 25, p. 165; B. Schmidt, op. cit. p. 133.

Libyaeque filiae a Iove amatae atque in Italiam, ubi nomen dedit urbi Lamiae, delatae pueros cum primum nascerentur omnes Iuno maligne interemisse fertur, adeo ut illa aliarum invidia feminarum adducta pueros his furto arreptos saevissime interficeret, atque in omne tempus fieret parvulis posthac formido terriculaeque.<sup>1</sup>

Lamia vero appellabatur *μορμολύκειον* (schol. *Eg.* 693) aut *μορμώ* (schol. *Pac.* 474),<sup>2</sup> quae etiam cum Gorgonibus vel sola Gorgo coniungebatur. nam ut illius domicilium fuisse dicitur Libya, sic Gorgonum, *Ran.* 477: *Τιβράσιος, τόπος τῆς Λιβύης, ἔνθα αἱ Γοργόνες διέτριβον* (Ven.). noster quidem de hac re ab auctore scholiastae Ap. Rh. (4. 1515) et Ps.-Apollodori (2. 3. 4) plane differt, qui Hesiodum (*Theog.* 270 sqq.) secutus Gorgones dixerat litus incolere Oceani occidentale, noster autem — haud dubie Didymus, cum eandem ap. schol. Pind. *P.* 10. 72 sententiam invenerimus — Euripidi (*Bacch.* 990) et Herodoto (2. 91) adstipulatus est.<sup>3</sup> de Perseo eiusque cum Gorgonibus certamine tacet noster, quamquam occasionem illius fabulae narrandae dedit poeta *Thesm.* 1101. historiam tamen videtur cognosse quam Ps.-Apollodorus (2. 7. 3)<sup>4</sup> tradit de Hercule, quem ait Gorgonis cirrum a Minerva donatum Aeropae<sup>5</sup> Cephei filiae dedisse, quo hostes illo absente conspectu conferritos averteret. quam historiam tacite scholiastam significare existimo *Eg.* 1181: *ἡ Γοργολόφα· ἡ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς τῆς Γοργούς τὴν περικεφαλαίαν ἔχουσα.*

Hecates consimilis<sup>6</sup> alius genius vulgo ab hominibus metuebatur, qui somniantibus potissimum formidulose incubaret, qua re *Ἐφιάλης*, quasi *ὁ ἐπιπυδών*,<sup>7</sup> dicebatur. nominis vero huius formas alias ali tradunt, id quod in verbo populari et quotidiano sermone usitato expectandum erat. Hesychius enim voces memorat *ἐφέλης*, *ὠφέλης*, *ἐπωφέλης*, *ἰφιάλος*, *ἐπιάλλης*. quarum vocum postremae simillimam

<sup>1</sup> cf. Diod. 20. 41; Suid. s. *Λάμια*; schol. Aristid. 3, p. 42, Dind.

<sup>2</sup> cf. schol. Plat. *Gorg.*, p. 473 D.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Paus. 2. 21. 6; Rosch. *Gorgonen*, p. 27, adn. 50.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Paus. 8. 47. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Suid. s. *Πλόκιον Γοργάδος*.

<sup>6</sup> Strab. 1, p. 19: *ἡ τε γὰρ Λάμια μύθος ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ Γοργώ καὶ Ἐφιάλης καὶ ἡ Μορμολόκη.*

<sup>7</sup> Hesych. s. v.; cf. s. *ἐπιάλλης*, *ἰφιάλος*, *ὠφέλης*.

profert Didymus apud schol. *Vesp.* 1038: ἡπιάλος τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πυρετοῦ κρύος . . . Δίδυμος δὲ φησι, δαίμων ὃν Ἡπιάλην καὶ Τίφυν καὶ Εὐόπαν καλοῦσι . . . hunc deum vel genium, quem febrem praebere credebant,<sup>1</sup> non diversum esse ab illis quos supra memoravi, docet Photius: Τίφης·<sup>2</sup> ὁ καλούμενος ἐπιάλης. quapropter hos genios variis ita nominibus praeditos non cum Hecate et Pane solum, sed etiam cum Aesculapio aliquid habuisse commune videmus ex Artemidoro (2. 34; cf. 2. 37): τῶν δὲ ἐπιγείων [sc. δαιμόνων] αἰσθητοὶ μὲν Ἑκάτη καὶ Πάν καὶ Ἐφιάλης καὶ Ἀσκληπιός . . . οἱ μὲν αἰσθητοὶ θεοὶ φόβων καὶ κινδύνων καὶ περιστάσεων εἰσι σημαντικοί· καὶ γὰρ μεθ' ἡμέραν ἐπιφερόμενοι τῶν τοιούτων αἴτιοι καθίστανται. ex quo intellegitur et Aesculapium daemonem olim inimicum et nocentem esse habitum, qui sacris piandus esset.<sup>3</sup> illud quoque licet colligere, locis principio humilibus et palustribus, ubi e stagnis a sole excitati circa meridiem potissimum vapores pestiferi oriuntur, id diei tempus nocens horribileque creditum esse.<sup>4</sup>

itidem Typho monstrum erat pestiferum, quem cum globus esset is densus ignis vel nubes e terra exhalatus (ἡ ἐξ ἀναθυμιάσεως τῆς γῆς σοντροφή, *Lys.* 273, *Eg.* 511), e dea Terra<sup>5</sup> genitum esse fingebant (*Eg.* 511); quem magnopere veriti etiam di varias formas ut eum fugerent induebant (ibid.). huic turbine oriente ovis nigra immolabatur (*Ran.* 847). is quoque sicut Hydra, cuius pater ferebatur<sup>6</sup> esse, capita habebat centum (*Pac.* 756).

atque inter hunc geniorum numerum, ut supra apud Artemidorum vidimus, ipse reponendus est Pan, cui, utpote loca cum silvestria tum palustria incolenti sacra fuit syrinx (*Ran.* 231). de genere quidem Panis, quod tantum scriptoribus fabularum praebeuit negotium<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> cf. Cic. *N. D.* 3. 10. 24, 3. 25. 63.

<sup>2</sup> cf. s. Ἡπιάλης· ἐπιάλης· ὁ πικρῶν ὑπὸ τινων. porro Suid. ii., p. 387, Bernhardt; Zonar., p. 790; *E. M.* 434. 13; Eust. 561, 16, 1687. 51.

<sup>3</sup> neque absurdum est fortasse eius nomen vetustum ἡπίος cum illo ἡπιάλος comparare; *E. M.* 434. 15.

<sup>4</sup> cf. in libris sacris Iudaicis (*Ps.* 91. 6), "the destruction that wasteth at noonday," quod Graece sic verum est: ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ (B. Schmidt, op. cit. p. 96).

<sup>5</sup> cf. supra, p. 87.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Goettling ad Hes. *Theog.* 313.

<sup>7</sup> schol. Eur. ii. p. 328, Schwartz.

nihil quaesiit scholiasta, qui tamen deum iuvenem et silvestrem et gregum tutorem novit (*Plut.* 1050, *Av.* 745). ac sicut Empusae pes asininus tribuebatur, similiter Pani hircinus.<sup>1</sup> huic praeterea deo loca deserta incolenti, ubi ipso silentio mentes iter facientium metu solent perturbatae esse quodam, maximo cum tumultu strepituque se obviam ferebant (*Lys.* 2).

restat ut de re satis recondita quae ad huius dei ingenium venerationemque meo quidem iudicio magnopere pertineat paucis disseram. exstat enim apud Suidam (s. *ὄνειροπολεῖν*), qui ex archetypo ampliora quam scriba ad *Nub.* 16 conservavit, scholium quo discimus semen viris noctu emitti per vim geniorum esse creditum: τὸ δὲ ὄνειρώσσειν [dicitur] ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτομάτως γονῆν (schol. γόνον) ἀφιέντων, ὅπερ οἱ ἐρωτόληπτοι πάσχουσιν, ἢ ἀπὸ βρωμάτων ἢ ἀπὸ δαιμόνων ἐνεργείας τοῦτο πάσχοντες.<sup>2</sup> hos genios vero cum Sirenibus coniungendos esse, easque esse species nocturnas, accurate ac copiose demonstravit Crusius.<sup>3</sup> hae autem in genus Naiadum,<sup>4</sup> quae usque ad hunc diem nymphae esse a rusticis creduntur,<sup>5</sup> item revocandae sunt, quae Pani super montes et per silvas vaganti comitentur.<sup>6</sup> deinde ex hac serie et quasi catena rationum, si quidem eam probe coniunxi, Panem quoque et Sirenes maximam affinitatem videmus inter se habuisse: quapropter ille quidem recte dicitur ἐρωτικός (*Lys.* 911), quippe qui more Sirenium homines somniis decipit inani visu. hinc quoque qua ratione ille et Ephialtes connexi sint facile intellegitur; cf. Bekk. *An.* 1. 42 ἡπιάλῃς· ὁ ἐπιπίπτων καὶ ἐφέρπων τοῖς κοιμωμένοις δαίμων.<sup>7</sup>

quaerentibus nobis de obscuris Graecorum religionibus magnopere

<sup>1</sup> schol. *Ran.* 230. Didymus hic duplici modo illud κεροβάτας interpretatur: vel quod cornu gerat vel quod τὴν βάσιν habeat κερατίνην, ἑπερ ἱστορεῖται τὰ κάτω τράγου ἔχων. putes igitur eundem similia commenta ad *Ran.* 293-294 de Empusa composuisse.

<sup>2</sup> cf. schol. *Od.* 22. 198.

<sup>3</sup> *Philol.* 50, pp. 97 seqq.

<sup>4</sup> *Ap. Rh.* 4. 896; *Ov. M.* 5. 552.

<sup>5</sup> B. Schmidt, op. cit., p. 98.

<sup>6</sup> schol. *Eur. Rhes.* 36.

<sup>7</sup> praeterea hac de re cf. *Ran.* 475: μύραινα, δαίμων φοβερά· παρὰ τὸ μύρεσθαι, quod verbum conlato Hesychio, qui μύροντο per ἐβρέχοντο explicat, sensu obsceno haud dubie accipiendum est.



est dolendum quod commentarii illi copiosi in Aristophanem et Menandrum, a viris Alexandrinis conscripti, perierunt atque in omne tempus nobis amissi sunt. horum tamen testimonia de illa superstitione et timore erga heroas mortuosque, quem ii comici saepe adridebant,<sup>1</sup> hic illic etiam nunc apud scholiastam conservata offendimus. huc pertinet gravissimum scholium *Av.* 1490 (Suid. Ὁρέστης) quod ad Didymum una cum Zenobii loco (5. 60; cf. Suid. Οὐκ εἰμί), referendum est propterea quod utroque loco Menandri verba pariter citantur: οἱ ἥρωες δὲ δυσόργητοι καὶ χαλεποὶ τοῖς ἐμπελάζουσι γίνονται, καθάπερ Μένανδρος ἐν Συνερίφοις . . . ὅτι ἀγαθὸν γάμον χειμῶνος ὁ θεὸς δίδωσιν, οὐδ' ἥρωσιν εἰς τοῦτο δύναμιν, ἀλλ' ἀποπλήκτους μὲν ποιεῖν δύνανται, τὸ δὲ ὠφέλῃς οὐ κέκτηνται. διό μοι δοκοῦσι καὶ οἱ τὰ ἡρώα παριόντες σιγὴν ἔχειν, ὡς Μυρτίλος ἐν Τιτανόπασί φησιν. verba post illa Μένανδρος ἐν corrupta esse patet. recte supposuit Heringa Συνεφήβοις pro Συνερίφοις; hiatus a Dindorfio indicatus. Schnee haec proponit:<sup>2</sup> ὅτι ἀγαθὸν καλὸν τε μόνος ὁ θεὸς δίδωσιν, οὐδ' ἥρωσιν εἰς τοῦτο δύναμις, quae tamen haud sufficiunt. nam rectissime dicitur χειμῶνος, id quod docet schol. *Pac.* 278: τὰ μυστήρια τῶν Καβείρων. δοκοῦσι δὲ οἱ μεμνημένοι ταῦτα δίκαιοι τε εἶναι καὶ ἐκ δεινῶν σφύζεσθαι καὶ ἐκ χειμῶνων (ubi Rav.: δοκοῦσι δὲ οἱ μεμνημένοι ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν κακῶν σφύζεσθαι καὶ ἐκ χειμῶνων). quae quoniam χειμῶνων non proprie sed usitata dicitur translatione, poetam suggerunt aliquem.<sup>3</sup> equidem nescio an legendum sit: ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἐκ χειμῶνος ὁ θεὸς δίδωσι, ut haec et quae insequuntur verba sic interpreter: deus quidem res dat prosperas e periculis et tempestate, heroibus autem hanc vim benevolentiamque is non addidit. quam explanationem in eo cum ingeniis heroum credo consistere, quod ii usque nocentes et malevolentes habebantur, placationemque exigebant.<sup>4</sup> quin etiam in proverbium venerat, ut is qui humanitatem sibi vindicare vellet diceret οὐκ εἰμί τοῦτων τῶν ἡρώων.<sup>5</sup> quam ob rem ne hos difficiles atque iracundos in se excitarent, homines delubra eorum noctu praetereuntes magno cum silentio iter faciebant, neque ultro eis

<sup>1</sup> cf. Rosch. s. *Heros*, p. 2479.

<sup>2</sup> *Beiträge*, p. 30.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Aesch. *Prom.* 1015.

<sup>4</sup> cf. schol. *Thesm.* 1054: ἐκ τῶν δαυμόνων τὰ ἀχρῆσχον.

<sup>5</sup> Suid. s.v.; Zenob. 5. 60.

audebant oculos conicere (*Av.* 1490, 1493).<sup>1</sup> nam quo modo heros poenas sumeret ab eis qui se violassent, docet Zenobius,<sup>2</sup> qui de Anagyro heroe Attico haec narrat: τινὲς δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτε Ἀνάγυρος ἥρως γέγονεν, ὅστις τοὺς οἴκους τῶν γειτονούντων αὐτῷ ἐκ βάθρων ἀνέστρεψεν, ἐπειδὴ τὸ ἥρῳον αὐτοῦ ὑβρίσαι ἐπεχείρησαν. μέμνηται ταύτης [h.e. τῆς παροιμίας, Ἀνάγυρον κινεῖν] ἐν Λυσιστράτῃ (v. 67).<sup>3</sup> sed quoniam poetam memorat ipsum Zenobius, mihi quidem videtur haec a paroemiographo servata aut e Didymi commentariis in *Lysistratam*, qua re inter nostra scholia inferenda sint, aut e libro eius de proverbiiis sumpta esse. eiusdem vero est scholium (*Av.* 1490) quod supra adtuli, si quidem ille pro Athenaei<sup>4</sup> auctore habendus est: nam ita cum nostro patet hunc (*II.* 461 B-C) cum re tum verbis convenire, ut varios utrique fontes vix fuisse dicas. atque Athenaeus quidem adfirmat se a Chamaeleonis Heracleota sumpsisse, ita tamen ut dubites, comparato 497 E, utrum ille an Theophrastus horum re vera auctor sit.

atque eo magis metuebant heroas, quos in scaenam etiam Aeschylus inducebat saevos atque acerbos,<sup>5</sup> quod formis saepe horridis eos fingebant: id quod de Lyco quidem et poeta testatur ipse et scholiasta (*Vesp.* 821): ὡς δυσμόρφου γεγραμμένου τοῦ ἥρωος.<sup>6</sup>

ubi vero in urbem pestilentia inciderat gravior, sacrificiis nonnunquam per triginta dies factis heroas placabant, quod ex ipsa fallacia constat qua Athenienses Themistoclis ossa receperunt: λοιμωξάντων δὲ Ἀθηναίων ὁ θεὸς εἶπε μετάγειν τὰ ὅσῃ Θεμιστοκλέους. Μαγνήτων δὲ μὴ συγχωρούντων, ἤτήσαντο ἐπὶ λ' ἡμέραις ἐναγίσαι τῷ τάφῳ. καὶ περισκηπώσαντες τὸ χωρίον λάθρα κομίζουσιν ἀνορύξαντες τὰ ὅσῃ (*Eq.* 84). quibus sacris votisque genius ante malevolus saepe benignus fiebat, ut de Theseo a nostro narratur *Plut.* 627.

ac talis genius Aesculapius quoque videtur olim fuisse, qui tristis antea nocensque, ut omen averteretur, ἥπιος appellatus est.<sup>7</sup> huic igitur sicut aliis heroibus angues fuisse sacros testatur *Plut.* 733:

<sup>1</sup> cf. Rosch., p. 2478.

<sup>2</sup> 12. 58; cf. Apostol. 9. 79; Suid. s. Ἀναγυράσιος.

<sup>3</sup> cf. p. 144.

<sup>4</sup> Christ, p. 540.

<sup>5</sup> schol. *Ran.* 837: ἀγροὺς εἰσάγοντα καὶ ὤμοις τοῦς ἥρωας.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Harpocr. δεκάζων, Suid. Λόκον εἶδες.

<sup>7</sup> vid. pp. 154, 161 adn. 3.

κοινῶς μὲν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἥρωσι δράκοντες παρτίθεντο, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ. et omnibus heroibus ut infernis cena illa tertio Anthesteriorum die dedicabatur;<sup>1</sup> qui deinde placati et benigni redditi ἄνακες, id est σωτῆρες vel servatores, invocabantur.<sup>2</sup> quapropter etiam lectisterniis celebrabantur, quae Graece θεοξένια vel ξένια appellantur; cuius rei testis est schol. Pind. *Nem.* 2. 19: διὰ τιμῆς ἦγον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν Αἴαντα ὥς (= ὥστε) μὴ μόνον Αἰαντίδα φυλὴν ἀποδεῖξαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ κλίνην αὐτῷ μετὰ παγοπλίας κατακοσμεῖν, quod adtuli ad aliud scholium illustrandum (*Vesp.* 823): εἶχον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἥρωες παγοπλίαν. itaque carmina quae scholia dicuntur in certos heroas caneant Aiacem Telamonium et Admetum.<sup>3</sup> ante convivium mensis iam sublatis primum boni genii bibebant poculum, ut testantur Theopompus Apollodorusque apud schol. *Vesp.* 525 (cf. *Eq.* 85, *Pac.* 300); eundemque genium partim ioco partim omnis causa secundi dicit poeta Πράμνιον *Eq.* 107, ἔλχ' ἔλκε τὴν τοῦ δαίμονος τοῦ πρᾶμνίου, ubi unus quidem scholiasta explicat τοῦ προσηνοῦς,<sup>4</sup> eadem ratione qua Aesculapius ἥπιος dicebatur.

Iam habes fere quae mihi de his rebus disserenda esse putarem. verum quod ad summam argumenti adinet de scholiastae auctoribus, haec habeo quae breviter repetam. scholia perscrutati ad deos pertinentia auctoritatem habuisse vidimus maximam Didymum, qui non palam nominatur solum, sed eo quoque deprenditur, quod permulta invenimus scholia valde eorum similia quae in Homerum, Pindarum, Sophoclem, Euripidem ab illo scripta sunt,<sup>5</sup> permulta etiam cum Athenaeo proverbiorumque scriptoribus cognata. quin equidem vehementer dubito an fabulas notitiasque deorum apud scholiastam repertas ad grammaticum ultra eum quemquam tuto referre possimus, quamvis insolenter sane evenerit ut Euphronius grammaticus antiquissimus<sup>6</sup> de dis quaesisse videatur (pp. 87, 108,

<sup>1</sup> schol. *Lys.* 612; cf. *Ach.* 961.

<sup>2</sup> schol. Eur. *Hipp.* 88; Plut. *Thes.* 33.

<sup>3</sup> schol. *Ach.* 980, *Vesp.* 1239; Suid. *Οὐδέποτε* ἐγώ, Πάριος; Athen. 15, p. 695 C.

<sup>4</sup> haec interpretatio non est Didymi; cf. Athen. 1, p. 30 D.

<sup>5</sup> et Platonis scholia invenimus interdum ex eodem fonte nata (pp. 87, 126, 141, 147, 160). — ceterum cave ne nimia de dis quae scholiasta servavit Symmacho attribueris, qui persaepe Didymea pro suis venditavit. Schmidt, p. 296.

<sup>6</sup> eius discipulus fuit Aristophanes; vid. Schmidt, pp. 294, 295; Susemihl i. 281.

123). ceteri autem praeter Didymum grammatici plerumque tantum ad verba singula explananda laudati sunt; hique ab interpretationibus quibus fabulares historiae intersint nonnunquam velut abhorrent, dum modo alia ratione verba liceat poetae explicare (pp. 114, 116, 125).

sed Didymus, etiam si grammaticos aetate superiores non consuluerit de his rebus, aliis profecto nisus est subsidiis. atque nos, conlatis scholiis nostris cum Ps.-Apollodoro, scholiasta Apollonii, Diodoro, levia quaedam indicia nanci sumus quibus in eam inducimur opinionem, Didymum legisse eorum auctorem communem Dionysium (pp. 101, 111, 121, 127, 130, 141, 144, 145). atque hoc quoque observandum, similitudines has graviores pondere esse quam discrepantias (pp. 89, 111, 147). longo autem post Didymum tempore in scholia inlata ea sunt quae e Ps.-Apollodoro fideliter exscripta servantur (pp. 127, 145, 148), sicut quaedam e Cornuto sumpta (pp. 92, 127; cf. 103). praeterea Didymus usus est Apollodoro (pp. 90, 92, 100, 108, 109, 121, 126, 129, 130, 137, 154, 157; cf. *Ran.* 330); historicis (pp. 96, 100, 103, 112, 116, 118, 123, 135, 137); Aristotele (pp. 98, 99); rerum scriptoribus Atticarum (pp. 128, 139, 141, 143, 144) quos secutus est Istrus (pp. 112, 139, 142, 143, 151); Polemone (91); Anticlides (96); raro poetis epicis (pp. 137 sq., 146); denique tragicis saepissime (cf. p. 135).

## H AS A MUTE IN LATIN.

BY E. S. SHELDON.

WHY did the Latin grammarians count *h* as one of the mutes? As this doubtless goes back to a time before *h* had universally or prevailingly ceased to be pronounced at all, we cannot admit the somewhat punning answer that it was because *h* was really mute or silent, expressing no sound. Perhaps the explanation is rather to be found by considering the nature of the sound itself. As a mere breathing *h* had no clear and distinct sound which could be prolonged and easily recognized as an element of speech like *f* or *s*; if it was prolonged, the result was only almost inaudible breath, and its effect as a consonant was plainly noticeable only when a vowel immediately followed, so as to produce a contrast between unvoiced breath and voice.<sup>1</sup> It was accordingly perceptible merely as a *Vocaleinsatz* (see Sievers, *Phonetik*, 4th ed., cap. 17, p. 138 ff.), and as such gave the effect of a momentary consonant, and was classed with the other momentary consonants, the *mutae*, rather than with the continuous consonants, the *semivocales*. Like the former it was regularly accompanied by a vowel, and probably seemed to the Roman grammarians as unpronounceable without a vowel as *b*, *c*, *d*, etc. Having the letter in common use they had to class it either as a *muta* or as a *semivocalis*, and could not altogether ignore this speech-sound in their classification of the letters, as the Greek grammarians could and did. The Latin classification may have been influenced, however, also by the fact that the Greek

---

<sup>1</sup> In this connection I may note that some nineteen or twenty years ago, while speaking with a German student at the University of Berlin, I illustrated to him the untrilled English *r* by pronouncing it without voice and alone. He said he heard nothing. Yet the breath rustle was probably more audible than that of *h*, and he would not have failed to hear an *r* before a vowel in my English pronunciation. His own *r* was trilled with the tip of the tongue.

aspirates,  $\phi$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\chi$ , represented in Latin spelling by  $ph$ ,  $th$ ,  $ch$ , were usually classed among the mutes, and I will not omit to add that by counting  $h$  as a mute the Latin grammarians brought their number of *mutae* up to nine ( $b, c, d, g, h, k, p, q, t$ ), the number recognized for Greek.

## GENERAL INDEX.

---

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>             Achilles, 145.<br/>             Adonis feriae, 90.<br/>             Aesculapius, 152 ff., 164.<br/>             Aethiopica of Heliodorus, stage-terms<br/>                 in, 1 ff.<br/>             Ajax Oilei, 146.<br/>             Ajax Telamonius, 146.<br/>             Alectryon, 105.<br/>             Amor, 84.<br/>             Amphictyones, 103.<br/>             Anagyrus, 144 f., 164.<br/>             ἀναγκαῖον ἐστί, case after, 55.<br/>             Anthesteria, 159.<br/>             Aphrodite, 88.<br/>             Apollo, 96 ff.<br/>             Apollodorus, used by Didymus, 166.<br/>             Ἀρατῆριον, 141.<br/>             Ἄρης, 104.<br/> <i>argumentum</i>, meaning of, 18.<br/>             Argus, 117.<br/>             Aristaeus, 101.<br/>             Aristarchus, 83.<br/>             Aristophanes, Scholia, 83 ff.<br/>             Aristotle, used by Didymus, 166.<br/>             Artemis, 105 ff.<br/>             Articulation, nature of, 58.<br/>             Ἀσκληπιός, 152 ff., 164.<br/>             δσφάλειος (Poseidon), 120.<br/>             Athamas, 147.<br/>             Athene, 110 ff.<br/>             Atthidographi, 139, 141 f.<br/>             Attic legends, 141 ff.<br/>             Avernus, lake, 134.<br/> <br/>             Bacchae of Euripides, notes on, 45 ff.         </p> | <p>             Bacchus, 129 ff.<br/>             Bear in rites of Artemis, 107.<br/>             Boehm, on cottabus, 73 ff.<br/>             Brauronia, 106.<br/> <br/>             Callistratus, used by scholiasts, 83 f.<br/>             Castor and Pollux, 149 f.<br/>             Cebriones, 89.<br/>             Cecrops, 143 f.<br/>             Celeus, 128.<br/>             Ceres, 126 f.<br/>             Chaos, 84.<br/>             Characters in ancient novels, 16.<br/>             χελῶναι ξυλῖναι, 91.<br/>             χρηστομάθειαι, meaning, 16.<br/>             Cimmerii, 134.<br/>             Combinations, possible as initial, 66.<br/>             Consonants assimilated, 65.<br/>             Corybantes, 126.<br/>             Cottabus, game of, 73 ff.<br/>                 experiments with, 81.<br/> <i>cp</i>, not making position, 68.<br/> <i>crambe</i>, 131.<br/>             Curetes, 126.<br/>             Curtain in Greek Theatre, 26.<br/>             Cybele, 86.<br/>             Cyllene, mountain, 116.<br/> <br/>             Dead, worship of, 156.<br/>             Demeter, 126 ff.<br/> <i>Di antiquissimi</i>, 84 ff.<br/>                 <i>inferi</i>, 126 f.<br/>                 <i>olympii</i>, 88 f.<br/>             Didymus, 83 ff.<br/>                 chief authority of Scholia, 165.         </p> |
|---|--|

- διηγήματα*, meaning of, 18.  
     rhetorical term, 3.  
 Dieuchidas, 100.  
*δικανικά*, meaning, 19.  
 Dionysius Scytobrachion, 166.  
*Διώνυσος*, 129 f.  
 Dis, 127.  
 Double consonants, 60.  
     treated as single, 64.  
*δράμα*, meaning and use of, 2 ff.  
     in Achilles Tatius, 8.  
     in Chariton, 14.  
     in Eustathius, 11.  
     in Heliodorus, 3.  
     in Photius, 16.  
     in Plato, 15.  
     in late literature, 15.  
     in Theodorus Prodromus, 14.  
 Dramatic, ancient meaning, 15.  
 Dramatic feeling of Heliodorus, 1.  
*δραματικά*, meaning, 19.  
*δραματικόν*, 18.  
 Dramatists, references to in Heliodorus, 1.  
  
 EARLE, M. L., Notes on the Bacchae of Euripides, 46 ff.  
 Early Latin Prosody, 57 ff.  
 Elements of speech, how combined, 59.  
 Eleusinian Mysteries, light in, 37.  
 Emendations. Eur. *Bacch.* (13-24), 45;  
     (101 f.), 46; (126), 46; (150), 46;  
     (210 f.), 47; (440), 47; (460 f.),  
     48; (688), 48; (1088), 48.  
 Diog. Laert. (ii 46), 99.  
 Hesychius, 138.  
 Lysias (vii 39), 49; (xvi 6), 49.  
 Phot. *Lex.* 103.  
 Schol. Aristoph. (*Acc.* 510), 120;  
     (*Acc.* 682), 120; (*Av.* 1490), 163;  
     (*Eg.* 84), 109; (*Eg.* 566), 133;  
     (*Lys.* 645), 106; (*Pac.* 1126), 125;  
     (*Plut.* 604), 102; (*Plut.* 686), 153;  
     (*Ran.* 1033), 128; (*Ran.* Argum.),  
 Emendations — *continued.*  
     99; (*Thesm.* 899), 141; (*Vesp.*  
     1239), 143.  
 Empusa, 158.  
*ἐπαίτιος*, meaning, 49.  
*ἐπεισκυκλέω*, 38.  
*ἐπεισδίδωμι*, 39.  
*Ἐφιάλτης*, *Ἐφέλης*, 160.  
*Ἡπιδλής*, 160 f.  
 Epic poets, used by Didymus, 166.  
*ἥπιος* (Asclepius), 154, 161, 164.  
*ἐπιστάτης*, 113.  
*ἐπιτραγυδέω*, 40.  
*Ἐριβεί*, 135 f.  
*Ἔρως*, 84.  
*est*, shortened, 64.  
 Eumenides, 135 f.  
 Euphronius, 83, 165.  
 Euripides' *Bacchae*, notes on, 45 ff.  
 Experiments with cottabus, 81.  
  
*fabula*, meaning, 18.  
 Fabulae Atticae, 141 ff.  
 Flute-player, position of, 27.  
 Furies, 135.  
  
 Genetyllis, 94.  
 Gorgo, Gorgones, 144, 160.  
 Graces, 195.  
 GREENOUGH, J. B., Early Latin Pro-  
     sody, 57 ff.  
 GULICK, C. B., De Scholiis Aristopha-  
     neis, 83 ff.  
  
*h* as mute in Latin, 167 f.  
*ἡιδης*, 133 ff.  
 Halirrhothius, 121.  
 HAYLEY, H. W., The κότταβος κατακτός,  
     73 ff.  
 Hecate, 156 ff.  
*ἐκάταια*, *ἐκαταία*, 157 ff.  
 Heliodorus's Aethiopica, stage-terms  
     in, 1 ff.  
     date of, 2.



- Ἡφαιστοί, 113 ff., 125.  
 Ἡρα, 122 ff.  
 Hercules, 136 ff.  
 Hermes, 115 ff.  
 Heroes, 145 ff.  
 Ἑστία, 118 ff.  
 ἱερὸς γάμος, 125.  
*historia*, meaning, 18.  
*ιστορίαι*, meaning, 16.  
 Historians, used by Didymus, 166.  
*ιστορικόν*, = *historia*, 18.  
*ἱστήρια*, sacrifice, 92.  
  
 Iapetus, 84.  
 Icarus, 132.  
 Infernal regions, descents to, 133.  
 Io, 117.  
  
 Juno, 122 ff.  
 Jupiter, 122 ff.  
  
 Καλλιγένεια, 129.  
 Κανακή, Καναχή, 147.  
 καταβάτης, meaning, 124, 154.  
 Κωλιάς, 94.  
 κωμικός, 41.  
 κωμῳδία, 7, 41.  
 Κόρη, 126 ff.  
 κοτταβεῖα, with movable rod, 74.  
 κοτταβος δι' ὀξυβάφων, 73.  
 κοτταβος κατακτός, 73 ff.  
 κουροτρόφος, 118, 129, 157.  
 Κρόνοι, foolish old men, 86.  
  
 Lais, killed by Thracians, 91.  
 Lamia, 159 f.  
 λαμπάδιον, mask, 35.  
 λαμπάδιον δράματος, 30.  
 Lemnian women, 114.  
 Λευκοφρυγή (Artemis), 109.  
 Liquid before mute, not making position, 68.  
 Long syllables shortened in early Latin, 58.  
  
 Long vowel shortened and *s* suppressed, 63.  
 Λόκειος Apollo, 97.  
 Luxuria in Trinummus, 129.  
 Lysias, notes on, 49 ff.  
 XII, when delivered, 50.  
  
 μάνης of cottabus, 73, 77 ff.  
 Masks in MSS. of Terence, 34.  
 Pompeian, 36.  
 μηχανή in theatre, 43.  
 Medea and Jason, 147.  
 Midday demon, 158.  
 Miniatures in MSS. of Terence, 34.  
 MORGAN, M. H., Notes on Lysias, 49 ff.  
 μορμώ, μορμολύκειον, 160.  
 μυθικά, meaning, 19.  
 μυθικόν, = *fabula*, 18.  
 μύθος, μύθοι, meaning, 7, 19.  
 μυχία (Aphrodite), 95.  
 Mysteries, Eleusinian, rites in, 37.  
  
*narratio*, meaning, 18.  
 Neptune, 119 ff.  
 Nox, 84.  
 Nysa in Arabia, 130.  
  
 Oeneus, 148.  
 οἰκέται, ικέται, 120, 135.  
 Olives sacred to Athena, 111.  
 Ὀφέλης, 160.  
  
 παῖδιά ἐν λεκάνῃ, 73.  
 Pan, 117, 161 f.  
 Pastures sacred to Apollo, 96.  
 πάθος, meaning, 5.  
 Peleus, 145.  
 πέπλος, 113.  
 Phaërus, 83.  
 Phidias's statue of Aphrodite, 90.  
 Philomela, 144.  
 Phormio, miniatures in MSS. of, 36.  
 πλασματικά, meaning, 19.  
 πλάστικος of cottabus, 73 ff.



## INDEX OF IMPORTANT CITATIONS.

- Achill. Tat. (i, 3), 8; (i, 8), 8; (i, 9), 8;  
(i, 10), 10; (ii, 28), 10; (iii, 23),  
10; (v, 3), 9; (v, 5), 8; (vi, 3), 9;  
(vi, 16), 10; (viii, 5), 9; (viii, 9),  
9; (viii, 10), 9; (viii, 15), 9.  
Anon. (Walz. *Rhet.* i, p. 128), 20.  
Antiphanes (ii, 33 Kock), 77.  
Aphthon. (Speng. *Rhet.* ii, p. 22), 20.  
Apuleius, *Met.* (xi, 23), 37.  
Aristoph. *Av.* (1556), 158.  
*Pax* (1240), 75.  
Artemidorus (ii, 34), 161.  
Athenaeus (487<sup>e</sup>), 79; (666<sup>e</sup>), 74; (667<sup>e</sup>),  
73, 78, 80.  
  
Chariton (i, 4), 14; (iv, 4), 14.  
Cicero, *Inv.* (i, 19, 27), 21.  
Clemens, Alex., *Protr.* (p. 9), 37.  
Cornutus, *N. D.* (24), 92.  
  
Diodorus (iv, 68), 122.  
  
Eurip. *Bacch.* (13 ff.), 45; (101 f.), 46;  
(126), 46; (150), 46; (193), 46;  
(210 f.), 47; (440), 47; (460 f.), 48;  
(688), 48; (1088 f.), 48.  
Eustathius (p. 1053, 55), 115.  
Eustath. (Erot.), (ii, 6), 11 (v, 10), 11;  
(vi, 13), 12; (vi, 16), 12; (vii, 3),  
12; (viii, 11), 12; (viii, 14), 12;  
(ix, 10), 12.  
  
Heliodorus, *Aeth.*, Bekker's pages; (4),  
26, 30; (6), 6, 40; (11), 41; (41),  
41; (48), 6, 30, 40; (62), 6, 41;  
(63), 38, 39; (69), 5, 40; (77), 26;  
(129), 4, 30, 40; (135), 27; (168),  
5, 30; (172), 6; (175), 30; (185),  
4, 40; (186), 39; (187), 40, 41, 42;  
(194), 41; (244), 38; (249), 26;  
(259), 41; (289), 42; (310), 30,  
41.  
Hermogenes (p. 4, Speng.), 20; (p. 420),  
23.  
  
Inscriptions, *CIA.* iii (290), 152.  
  
Lysias (vii, 39), 49; (xii, 16), 52; (xii, 44),  
53; (xii, 60), 53; (xii, 65), 54;  
(xii, 77), 54; (xvi, 6), 55; (xvi, 7),  
55.  
  
Martian. Capell. V. (p. 185), 20.  
Matth. Cam. (Walz. *Rhet.* i, p. 122), 20.  
  
Nicolaus (Speng. *Rhet.* III, p. 455), 18,  
23.  
  
Pausanias (i, 14, 7), 89.  
Philostratus, *Vit. Ap.* (vi, 11), 39.  
Plutarch, *An Seni* (9), 32.  
*de Profect.* (10), 37.  
Pollux (iv, 151), 31.  
Priscian, *Pr. Rhet.* (2), 21.  
Propertius (iv, 12, 46), 33.  
  
Quintilian (ii, 4, 2), 18.

- cholia Aristoph. *Ach.* (418), 148;  
 (510), 120; (682), 120; (708),  
 128; (793), 91; (992), 89.  
*Av.* (386), 144; (369), 97; (436),  
 113; (465), 137; (471), 87;  
 (553), 89; (645), 144; (695),  
 150; (873), 108; (877), 86;  
 (933), 146; (1251), 88; (1490),  
 163 f.; (1527), 98.  
*Eccl.* (1029), 138.  
*Equit.* (84), 109; (297), 116; (539),  
 131; (566), 112; (698), 127;  
 (700), 132; (894), 101; (1056),  
 146; (1181), 160; (1312), 142;  
 (1321), 147.  
*Lys.* (2), 93; (138), 121; (299),  
 114; (443), 109; (447), 112;  
 (645), 106; (785), 148; (911),  
 162; (1299), 110.  
*Nub.* (16), 162; (52), 93, 94; (133),  
 102; (144), 96; (247), 85; (257),  
 147; (508), 154 ff.; (566), 119;  
 (623), 103; (749), 148; (989),  
 110; (1005), 121; (1006), 151;  
 (1050), 137; (1063), 145; (1068),  
 145; (1371), 147; (1468), 123.  
*Pax* (40), 92; (41), 95; (42), 124;  
 (277), 157; (289), 148; (410), 100;  
 (457), 104; (758), 159; (925), 137;  
 (1126), 125; (1244), 73, 78 f.  
*Plut.* (8), 103; (39), 103 f.; (210),  
 150; (303), 149; (594), 157; (604),  
 102; (627), 142; (639), 153; (686),  
 152; (690), 152; (701), 153; (733),  
 164; (773), 143; (845), 151; (1013),  
 139; (1021), 133; (1127), 139;  
 (1161), 116.  
*Ran.* Argum. 99; (216), 130; (293),  
 158; (324), 129; (366), 157; (475),  
 134; (477), 144, 160; (501), 139;  
 (849), 142, 147; (1033), 128;  
 (1238), 148; (1266), 116; (1356),  
 106.  
*Thesm.* (298), 129; (299), 118;  
 (899), 141; (977), 115.  
*Vesp.* (313), 141; (438), 143; (804),  
 157; (846), 118; (1035), 159;  
 (1038), 161; (1239), 143; (1271),  
 140; (1438), 127.  
 Scholia, Lucian *Lex.* (3), 73, 78.  
 Pind. *Nem.* (x, 96), 116.  
*Pyth.* (ii, 18), 116.  
 Plat. *Euthyd.* (291 b), 87.  
 Soph. *Phil.* (391 ff.), 86.  
 Theocr. (vii, 23), 87.  
 Serv. in *Georg.* (i, 18), 121.  
 Sextus Empir. *Math.* (i, 252), 20.  
 Sophocles (frag. 494 N.), 79.  
 Themistius, *Or.* (xx, 235), 37.  
 ap. Stob. *Flor.* (120), 37.





oxford University Libraries

3 6105 007 283 661

[illegible]

MAR 29 1982

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES  
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA  
94305

